Towards a self-consistent evaluation of gas dwarf scenarios for temperate sub-Neptunes

FRANCES E. RIGBY,^{1,*} LORENZO PICA-CIAMARRA,^{1,*} MÅNS HOLMBERG,^{1,*} NIKKU MADHUSUDHAN,^{1,*} SAVVAS CONSTANTINOU.^{1,*} LAURA SCHAEFER.² JIE DENG.³ KANANI K. M. LEE.⁴ and Julianne I. Moses⁵

¹ Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 0HA, UK

²Department of Geological Sciences, School of Earth, Energy, and Environmental Sciences,

Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

³Department of Geosciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

⁴Department of Physics, United States Coast Guard Academy, New London, CT 06320, USA

⁵Space Science Institute, 4765 Walnut Street, Suite B, Boulder, CO 80301, USA

ABSTRACT

The recent JWST detections of carbon-bearing molecules in a habitable-zone sub-Neptune have opened a new era in the study of low-mass exoplanets. The sub-Neptune regime spans a wide diversity of planetary interiors and atmospheres not witnessed in the solar system, including mini-Neptunes, super-Earths, and water worlds. Recent works have investigated the possibility of gas dwarfs, with rocky interiors and thick H_2 -rich atmospheres, to explain aspects of the sub-Neptune population, including the radius valley. Interactions between the H_2 -rich envelope and a potential magma ocean may lead to observable atmospheric signatures. We report a coupled interior-atmosphere modelling framework for gas dwarfs to investigate the plausibility of magma oceans on such planets and their observable diagnostics. We find that the surface-atmosphere interactions and atmospheric composition are sensitive to a wide range of parameters, including the atmospheric and internal structure, mineral composition, volatile solubility and atmospheric chemistry. While magma oceans are typically associated with high-temperature rocky planets, we assess if such conditions may be admissible and observable for temperate sub-Neptunes. We find that a holistic modelling approach is required for this purpose and to avoid unphysical model solutions. We find using our model framework and considering the habitable-zone sub-Neptune K2-18 b as a case study that its observed atmospheric composition is incompatible with a magma ocean scenario. We identify key atmospheric molecular and elemental diagnostics, including the abundances of $CO₂$, CO , $NH₃$ and, potentially, S-bearing species. Our study also underscores the need for fundamental material properties for accurate modelling of such planets.

1. INTRODUCTION

Sub-Neptune planets, with radii 1 R_⊕ $\lesssim R_{\rm p} \lesssim 4$ R_⊕, have emerged as the new frontier of exoplanet science and constitute the most numerous class of planets detected to date (e.g., [Fressin et al.](#page-19-0) [2013;](#page-19-0) [Fulton & Pe](#page-19-1)[tigura](#page-19-1) [2018\)](#page-19-1). The nature of the sub-Neptune population remains debated, as their bulk densities can be explained by a number of degenerate interior compositions (e.g. [Rogers et al.](#page-21-0) [2011;](#page-21-0) [Valencia et al.](#page-21-1) [2013\)](#page-21-1). These include rocky planets with diverse atmospheric compositions, mini-Neptunes with volatile-rich interiors and deep H2-rich atmospheres, and water worlds with sub-

Corresponding author: Nikku Madhusudhan [nmadhu@ast.cam.ac.uk](mailto: nmadhu@ast.cam.ac.uk)

stantial water mass fractions, including Hycean worlds (e.g., [Rogers et al.](#page-21-0) [2011;](#page-21-0) [Valencia et al.](#page-21-1) [2013;](#page-21-1) [Dorn et al.](#page-19-2) [2017;](#page-19-2) [Zeng et al.](#page-21-2) [2019;](#page-21-2) [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-0) [2020,](#page-20-0) [2021;](#page-20-1) [Rigby & Madhusudhan](#page-21-3) [2024\)](#page-21-3).

The James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) is revolutionising our understanding of sub-Neptunes through high-precision atmospheric spectroscopy. JWST observations have led to confident detections and precise abundance constraints for CH_4 and CO_2 in the atmospheres of the habitable-zone sub-Neptune and candidate Hycean world [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-1) [2021\)](#page-20-1) K2-18 b [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2), demonstrating the promise of JWST for detailed atmospheric characterisation. Furthermore, such observations are starting to be available for other temperate sub-Neptunes, including TOI-270 d [\(Holmberg & Madhusudhan](#page-20-3) [2024;](#page-20-3) [Benneke et al.](#page-18-0) [2024\)](#page-18-0) – where abundance constraints for CH_4 and CO_2 were also

[∗] These authors contributed comparably to this work.

retrieved – and LHS 1140 b [\(Doyon](#page-19-3) [2024;](#page-19-3) [Damiano et al.](#page-19-4) [2024\)](#page-19-4). Such precise abundance measurements pave the way towards understanding the interactions between the planet's atmosphere and interior, including the presence and nature of an underlying surface, as well as the planetary formation processes that give rise to such planets.

One of the most distinct features of the sub-Neptune population is the radius valley, a bimodal distribution of sub-Neptune radii with a minimum around 1.8 R_{\oplus} [\(Fulton et al.](#page-19-5) [2017;](#page-19-5) [Fulton & Petigura](#page-19-1) [2018;](#page-19-1) [Cloutier](#page-19-6) [& Menou](#page-19-6) [2020\)](#page-19-6). Two competing hypotheses have been proposed to explain the origin of the radius valley. One explanation suggests that the valley is a consequence of differential atmospheric mass loss between planets of different masses. In this hypothesis, both populations would be composed of planets with predominantly rocky interiors. The more massive planets would retain their primary H_2 -rich atmospheres, while the less massive ones would instead largely lose their envelope and hence have a smaller radius. We refer to the larger population, with rocky interiors and a deep H_2 -rich atmospheres, as gas dwarfs. The mechanism for the mass loss is debated, with the predictions of two hypotheses – photoevaporation (e.g., [Lopez & Fortney](#page-20-4) [2013;](#page-20-4) [Jin](#page-20-5) [et al.](#page-20-5) [2014;](#page-20-5) [Owen & Wu](#page-20-6) [2017;](#page-20-6) [Jin & Mordasini](#page-20-7) [2018\)](#page-20-7) and core-powered mass loss (e.g., [Ginzburg et al.](#page-19-7) [2016,](#page-19-7) [2018;](#page-19-8) [Gupta & Schlichting](#page-19-9) $2019, 2020$ $2019, 2020$ – both proposed to explain the observations [\(Rogers et al.](#page-21-4) [2021\)](#page-21-4). A second explanation (e.g., [Zeng et al.](#page-21-2) [2019;](#page-21-2) [Venturini et al.](#page-21-5) [2020;](#page-21-5) [Izidoro et al.](#page-20-8) [2021\)](#page-20-8) suggests that the valley could instead be due to planets having different interior compositions. The smaller radius population would be rocky, as in the atmospheric mass-loss scenario, while the larger population would be composed of planets with water-rich interiors due to significant accumulation of icy planetesimals/pebbles during their formation and migration. Atmospheric observations of planets in the sub-Neptune range may be able to distinguish between these two scenarios (e.g., [Kite et al.](#page-20-9) [2019,](#page-20-9) [2020;](#page-20-10) [Daviau & Lee](#page-19-11) [2021;](#page-19-11) [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [2022;](#page-19-12) [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [2022;](#page-21-6) [Charnoz](#page-19-13) [et al.](#page-19-13) [2023;](#page-19-13) [Misener et al.](#page-20-11) [2023;](#page-20-11) [Falco et al.](#page-19-14) [2024\)](#page-19-14).

While the gas dwarf hypothesis has garnered significant attention in the literature (e.g., [Lopez & Fortney](#page-20-4) [2013;](#page-20-4) [Jin et al.](#page-20-5) [2014;](#page-20-5) [Ginzburg et al.](#page-19-7) [2016;](#page-19-7) [Owen & Wu](#page-20-6) [2017;](#page-20-6) [Jin & Mordasini](#page-20-7) [2018;](#page-20-7) [Ginzburg et al.](#page-19-8) [2018;](#page-19-8) [Gupta](#page-19-9) [& Schlichting](#page-19-9) [2019;](#page-19-9) [Kite et al.](#page-20-9) [2019;](#page-20-9) [Gupta & Schlicht](#page-19-10)[ing](#page-19-10) [2020;](#page-19-10) [Kite et al.](#page-20-10) [2020;](#page-20-10) [Bean et al.](#page-18-1) [2021;](#page-18-1) [Schlichting](#page-21-6) [& Young](#page-21-6) [2022;](#page-21-6) [Charnoz et al.](#page-19-13) [2023\)](#page-19-13), several open questions remain. Firstly, it is unclear whether it is possible for rocky cores to accrete a substantial H_2 -rich envelope without significant accretion of other volatiles and ices [\(Fortney et al.](#page-19-15) [2013;](#page-19-15) [Venturini et al.](#page-21-7) [2024\)](#page-21-7). Secondly,

should such planets exist, would the atmosphere-interior interactions give rise to distinct atmospheric signatures? This might be expected if the rocky surface were to be molten, giving rise to a magma ocean scenario [\(Schae](#page-21-8)[fer et al.](#page-21-8) [2016;](#page-21-8) [Schaefer & Fegley](#page-21-9) [2017;](#page-21-9) [Kite et al.](#page-20-9) [2019,](#page-20-9) [2020;](#page-20-10) [Daviau & Lee](#page-19-11) [2021;](#page-19-11) [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [2022;](#page-19-12) [Schlicht](#page-21-6)[ing & Young](#page-21-6) [2022;](#page-21-6) [Misener et al.](#page-20-11) [2023;](#page-20-11) [Charnoz et al.](#page-19-13) [2023;](#page-19-13) [Falco et al.](#page-19-14) [2024;](#page-19-14) [Shorttle et al.](#page-21-10) [2024;](#page-21-10) [Tian &](#page-21-11) [Heng](#page-21-11) [2024\)](#page-21-11). It is, however, not fully clear whether this scenario is possible, particularly for planets with a low equilibrium temperature. For these planets, only a subset of atmospheric structures, combining sufficient but not exceedingly high surface pressure and very high surface temperature, could result in magma at the base of the atmosphere.

Several recent studies have explored the implications of a magma ocean on the atmosphere and interior compositions of diverse planets, both with terrestrial-like [\(Schaefer et al.](#page-21-8) [2016;](#page-21-8) [Schaefer & Fegley](#page-21-9) [2017;](#page-21-9) [Daviau &](#page-19-11) [Lee](#page-19-11) [2021;](#page-19-11) [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [2022;](#page-19-12) [Tian & Heng](#page-21-11) [2024\)](#page-21-11) and H2-rich atmospheres [\(Kite et al.](#page-20-9) [2019,](#page-20-9) [2020;](#page-20-10) [Schlicht](#page-21-6)[ing & Young](#page-21-6) [2022;](#page-21-6) [Misener et al.](#page-20-11) [2023;](#page-20-11) [Charnoz et al.](#page-19-13) [2023;](#page-19-13) [Falco et al.](#page-19-14) [2024;](#page-19-14) [Shorttle et al.](#page-21-10) [2024;](#page-21-10) [Tian & Heng](#page-21-11) [2024\)](#page-21-11). These works identify several key factors, including temperature and oxygen fugacity at the bottom of the atmosphere, that influence the composition of the atmosphere, driven by thermochemical equilibrium at the gas-melt interface. For example, some notable atmospheric signatures of reduced conditions in a rocky interior include potential nitrogen depletion (e.g., [Daviau &](#page-19-11) [Lee](#page-19-11) [2021;](#page-19-11) [Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [2022;](#page-19-16) [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [2023;](#page-21-12) [Shorttle](#page-21-10) [et al.](#page-21-10) [2024\)](#page-21-10) and high CO/CO_2 ratio for H₂-rich atmospheres [\(Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [2022;](#page-19-12) [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [2022\)](#page-21-6). However, the interplay between the atmosphere, interior, and the corresponding surface-atmosphere interactions in sub-Neptunes is only beginning to be explored in a realistic manner (e.g., [Kite et al.](#page-20-10) [2020;](#page-20-10) [Schlichting](#page-21-6) [& Young](#page-21-6) [2022\)](#page-21-6).

In this work, we develop an integrated magma ocean framework for temperate, H_2 -rich sub-Neptunes. Our framework, presented in Section [2,](#page-2-0) includes atmospheric and internal structure modelling, melt-gas interactions, and both equilibrium and disequilibrium processes in the atmosphere, resulting in spectroscopic predictions of atmospheric observables. We consider thermochemical equilibrium at the magma-atmosphere interface, and the solubility of volatile (H, C, N, O, S) bearing species in magma. We explore the extreme case of the habitablezone sub-Neptune and Hycean candidate K2-18 b [\(Mad](#page-20-0)[husudhan et al.](#page-20-0) [2020\)](#page-20-0) to investigate the plausibility of a magma ocean (e.g. [Kite et al.](#page-20-10) [2020;](#page-20-10) [Shorttle et al.](#page-21-10) [2024\)](#page-21-10) and, if present, its atmospheric signatures. In doing so, we first use our framework to perform a comparative assessment of previous works in this direction in Section [3,](#page-6-0) both on terrestrial-like atmospheres [\(Gaillard](#page-19-12) [et al.](#page-19-12) [2022\)](#page-19-12) and on H_2 -rich ones [\(Kite et al.](#page-20-9) [2019,](#page-20-9) [2020;](#page-20-10) [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [2022;](#page-21-6) [Charnoz et al.](#page-19-13) [2023;](#page-19-13) [Misener](#page-20-11) [et al.](#page-20-11) [2023;](#page-20-11) [Falco et al.](#page-19-14) [2024;](#page-19-14) [Shorttle et al.](#page-21-10) [2024;](#page-21-10) [Tian](#page-21-11) [& Heng](#page-21-11) [2024\)](#page-21-11), with a focus on the case study of the candidate Hycean world K2-18 b. We then present our model predictions in Section [4.](#page-10-0) Finally, we summarize our findings and discuss future work in Section [5,](#page-16-0) highlighting the need for physically consistent models, and new experimental and theoretical work to derive accu-

2. METHODS

rate fundamental material properties.

We develop an integrated modelling framework to evaluate gas dwarf scenarios for planets in the sub-Neptune regime. A schematic flowchart of the framework is shown in Figure [1.](#page-2-1) We start by considering the constraints that the observed bulk parameters (mass, radius, and hence density) and known atmospheric properties impose on the planet's atmospheric and internal structure. This enables us to infer the possible conditions at the surface-atmosphere boundary, and, by considering a relevant mineral phase diagram, assess whether such conditions can in principle lead to a magma ocean scenario. If they can, we proceed by modelling the chemistry at the magma-atmosphere interface, which is determined by equilibrium processes including the solubility of relevant volatiles in the silicate melt, providing us with the elemental abundances in the gas phase at the interface. These are then evolved to the rest of the atmosphere, assuming chemical equilibrium in the lower atmosphere, and non-equilibrium processes (photochemistry and vertical mixing) in the upper atmosphere. This allows us to compute the observable composition of the atmosphere, which can be compared with the molecular abundances retrieved through observations to finally assess the plausibility of a magma ocean scenario for the planet. We now describe in detail each of the steps outlined above.

2.1. Atmospheric Structure and Composition

We begin by modelling the atmospheric temperature structure in a self-consistent manner. In order to do so, the atmospheric chemical composition needs to be assumed. This can be done either by assuming the elemental abundances and atmospheric chemistry, or by directly assuming the molecular mixing ratios in the atmosphere. Other parameters that need to be taken into account include the internal temperature T_{int} representing an internal heat flux, the incident irradiation,

Figure 1. Flowchart showing an integrated modelling framework to assess gas dwarf scenarios for planets in the sub-Neptune regime.

the stellar properties, the presence and characteristics of clouds/hazes in the planet's atmosphere, and the efficiency of day-night energy redistribution. The selfconsistent calculation will yield a pressure-temperature $(P-T)$ profile, which will be coupled to the internal structure model, as discussed in Section [2.2.](#page-3-0)

In order to carry out the self-consistent modelling of the atmospheric structure, we use the GENESIS framework [\(Gandhi & Madhusudhan](#page-19-17) [2017\)](#page-19-17) adapted for sub-Neptunes [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-0) [2020;](#page-20-0) [Piette &](#page-21-13) [Madhusudhan](#page-21-13) [2020;](#page-21-13) [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-1) [2021,](#page-20-1) [2023a\)](#page-20-12). GENESIS solves for radiative-convective equilibrium throughout the atmosphere, which is assumed to be plane-parallel, using the Rybicki scheme. It carries out line-by-line radiative transfer calculations through the Feautrier method [\(Hubeny](#page-20-13) [2017\)](#page-20-13) and the discontinuous finite element method [\(Castor et al.](#page-19-18) [1992\)](#page-19-18), while taking into account all of the parameters mentioned earlier in this section.

For the atmospheric composition, we adopt uniform mixing ratios of molecular species based on the retrieved values at the terminator region of K2-18 b [\(Madhusud](#page-20-2)[han et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2). We use the median retrieved abundances for the one-offset case: $\log X_{\text{CH}_4} = -1.72$ and $\log X_{\text{CO}_2} = -2.04$. For H₂O, we consider the 95% oneoffset upper limit, $\log X_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = -3.01$. We also assume the incident irradiation and stellar properties of K2-18 b, and uniform day-night energy redistribution. We then explore the remaining parameter space. In particular, we consider two end-member values for T_{int} , 25 K and 50 K, following [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-0) [\(2020\)](#page-20-0) and [Valencia](#page-21-1) [et al.](#page-21-1) (2013) , and three values for a, the hazes' Rayleigh enhancement factor: 100, 1500 and 10000. We consider four combinations of these parameters, obtaining a cold case (designated C1, corresponding to $T_{\text{int}} = 25 \text{ K}$, $a = 10000$, two canonical cases (both with $a = 1500$, designated C2 for $T_{\text{int}} = 25$ K and C3 for $T_{\text{int}} = 50$ K) and a hot case (C4, with $T_{\text{int}} = 50$ K and $a = 100$). These profiles are shown in Figure [5.](#page-11-0)

We place the upper boundary of the atmosphere at 10^{-6} bar, and calculate the P-T profile self-consistently down to $10³$ bar, below the radiative-convective boundary. At higher pressures, we extrapolate the profile as an adiabat, using the H_2/He equation of state (EOS), $\rho = \rho(P,T)$, and adiabatic gradient from [Chabrier et al.](#page-19-19) (2019) . We note that, in principle, an appropriate P -T profile may be even colder than C1, considering the constraints on clouds/hazes at the terminator from observations of K2-18 b [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2).

2.2. Internal Structure Modelling

We model planetary internal structures using the HyRIS framework, outlined in [Rigby & Madhusudhan](#page-21-3) [\(2024\)](#page-21-3). The model calculates the planet radius $(R_{\rm p})$ from the planet mass (M_p) , the mass fractions of the planet's components $(x_i = M_i/M_p)$, and the corresponding EOS and P-T profile. HyRIS solves the equations for mass continuity and hydrostatic equilibrium using a fourth-order Runge-Kutta method, and solves for R_p using a bisection procedure. For the purpose of this study investigating magma-ocean scenarios, the internal structure model includes a H_2 -rich envelope, a silicate mantle, and an iron core.

The silicate mantle is described by EOSs valid for the liquid and solid phases – for simplicity, we adopt a separate EOS prescription on either side of a melting curve. The composition is nominally assumed to be peridotitic. The magma is described by an EOS for peridotitic melt compiled similarly to [Monteux et al.](#page-20-14) [\(2016\)](#page-20-14) by combin-

Figure 2. Cross-section of the internal structure of a potential gas dwarf, including the H_2 -rich envelope, silicate mantle and iron core.

ing the densities of molten enstatite, forsterite, fayalite, anorthite and diopside, described by third-order Birch-Murnaghan/Mie-Gruneisen EOSs from [Thomas & Asi](#page-21-14)[mow](#page-21-14) [\(2013\)](#page-21-14), weighted by their mass fractions. For the purpose of this initial study, we assume complete melting occurs at the liquidus, and hence do not include an EOS prescription for the partial melt between the solidus and liquidus curves. We use the peridotite liquidus from [Monteux et al.](#page-20-14) [\(2016\)](#page-20-14), based on [Fiquet et al.](#page-19-20) (2010) – both the liquidus and solidus are shown in Figure [3](#page-5-0) [\(Fiquet et al.](#page-19-20) [2010;](#page-19-20) [Monteux et al.](#page-20-14) [2016\)](#page-20-14). The solid portion of the silicate mantle is described by the EOS of [Lee et al.](#page-20-15) (2004) for the high-pressure peridotite assemblage. At extreme mantle pressures beyond the pressure range of these experiments (107 GPa), we use the temperature-independent EOS of [Seager et al.](#page-21-15) [\(2007\)](#page-21-15) for $MgSiO₃$ perovskite, originally derived at room temperature. The thermal effects for solid silicates at these pressures are small [\(Seager et al.](#page-21-15) [2007\)](#page-21-15) with negligible effect on the internal structure. The iron core is described by the EOS of [Seager et al.](#page-21-15) [\(2007\)](#page-21-15) for hexagonal close-packed Fe.

The temperature structure in the melt is assumed to be adiabatic. The adiabatic gradient is calculated using the specific heat for peridotite from [Monteux et al.](#page-20-14) [\(2016\)](#page-20-14) and the volume expansion coefficient that we calculate from the combined peridotite melt EOS. The adiabatic gradient in the upper portion of the solid mantle is calculated following [Lee et al.](#page-20-15) [\(2004\)](#page-20-15). Following previous studies (e.g., [Rogers et al.](#page-21-0) [2011;](#page-21-0) [Nixon & Madhusudhan](#page-20-16) [2021;](#page-20-16) [Rigby & Madhusudhan](#page-21-3) [2024\)](#page-21-3), the remaining solid portion of the interior is taken to be isothermal, as the EOSs used are temperature-independent [\(Seager et al.](#page-21-15) [2007\)](#page-21-15).

The mass of the magma ocean follows from the adiabatic temperature profile in the melt, similarly to the calculation of water ocean depths by [Nixon & Mad](#page-20-16)[husudhan](#page-20-16) [\(2021\)](#page-20-16) and [Rigby & Madhusudhan](#page-21-3) [\(2024\)](#page-21-3). The melt adiabat and hence the magma base pressure are defined by the surface pressure and temperature. For a given interior composition and surface conditions, the mass of the melt can thus be calculated. We adapt HyRIS to automate the extraction of the relevant melt characteristics, similar to the methods for water oceans in [Rigby & Madhusudhan](#page-21-3) [\(2024\)](#page-21-3). The mass fraction of the melt is an important quantity for considerations of the available volatile reservoir, as discussed below. We note that the moderate increase of the magma ocean mass fraction that may result from partial melting is partly accounted for by our range of considered melt masses in Section [4.3.](#page-12-0)

2.3. Melt-atmosphere Interface Chemistry

The atmospheric chemistry is constrained by the elemental composition at the bottom of the atmosphere, which is governed by the interactions at the magma ocean and atmosphere interface. At this boundary, we model the reactions and solubility of the gas species in thermochemical equilibrium. We include 82 H-C-N-O-S gas species and He, the set of which we denote X , and their equilibrium reactions, nominally excluding other effects such as condensation and exsolution. Of these volatile species, we consider the solubility in the melt of H_2 [\(Hirschmann et al.](#page-19-21) [2012,](#page-19-21) basalt case), H_2O [\(Iacono-](#page-20-17)[Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [2012\)](#page-20-17), CO [\(Yoshioka et al.](#page-21-16) [2019,](#page-21-16) MORB case), CO_2 [\(Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [2023\)](#page-21-12), CH_4 [\(Ardia et al.](#page-18-2) [2013\)](#page-18-2), N_2 [\(Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [2022\)](#page-19-12), S_2 [\(Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) 2022) and H2S [\(Clemente et al.](#page-19-22) [2004\)](#page-19-22), as further motivated in Ap-pendix [A.](#page-22-0) We note that the solubility of H_2S is uncertain at high temperatures/pressures and may be higher if, for example, its solubility approaches that of S_2 . Furthermore, we remark that we are not considering the possible exsolution of FeS, which may affect the abundance of sulfur in the atmosphere. Likewise, the overall solubility of nitrogen is calculated here through N_2 , and may be higher if the solubility of $NH₃$ is significant. The data on NH_3 solubility in magma is currently limited and it is difficult to make any quantitative estimates of $NH₃$ solubility. For the explicitly composition-dependent laws, we use the [Iacono-Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [\(2012\)](#page-20-17) Etna basalt melt composition. Similarly to [Kite et al.](#page-20-10) [\(2020\)](#page-20-10), we assume that the magma is well-stirred such that the

equilibration at the surface sets the volatile abundance throughout the melt.

These solubility laws relate the partial pressures in the atmosphere to the concentrations of the volatiles in the melt. The amount of volatiles in the melt thus depends on the equilibrium chemistry, the solubility and the total mass of the melt, M_{melt} . For a given mass of the atmosphere and the melt, we have the following mass balance condition for each species i (similar to [Gaillard](#page-19-12) [et al.](#page-19-12) [2022\)](#page-19-12),

$$
M_{\text{tot}} w_i = M_{\text{atm}} w_{i,\text{atm}} + M_{\text{melt}} w_{i,\text{melt}}, \qquad (1)
$$

where w_i is the total mass fraction of each species i.

To determine the chemical composition of the atmosphere and the melt, we solve the element conservation equations

$$
\varepsilon_j = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{X}} \nu_{ij} \frac{n_i}{n_{\langle H \rangle}},\tag{2}
$$

where n_i is the total amount of moles of species i, $n_{\langle H \rangle} = n_H + 2n_{H_2} + 2n_{H_2O} + \dots$ is the total amount of moles of hydrogen, ν_{ij} are the coefficients of the stoichiometric matrix, and ε_j is the elemental abundance of element j relative to hydrogen. Equation (2) is coupled to Equation [\(1\)](#page-4-1) via $n_i \propto w_i/\mu_i$, where μ_i is the molar mass, which in turn is coupled to the law of mass action

$$
\frac{p_i}{p^{\Theta}} = K_i \prod_{j \in E} \left(\frac{p_j}{p^{\Theta}}\right)^{\nu_{ij}}, \qquad (3)
$$

and the solubility laws, determining both $w_{i,\text{atm}}$ and $w_{i, \text{melt}}$. Here, E is the set of all elements, p_i is the partial pressure of species i, K_i is the temperature-dependent equilibrium constant, and p^{\oplus} is a standard pressure of 1 bar. For each gas species, we approximate the equilibrium constant as

$$
\ln K(T) = \frac{a_0}{T} + a_1 \ln T + b_0 + b_1 T + b_2 T^2, \quad (4)
$$

using the coefficients provided by FASTCHEM [\(Stock](#page-21-17) [et al.](#page-21-17) [2018,](#page-21-17) [2022\)](#page-21-18), mainly derived using thermochemical data from [Chase](#page-19-23) [\(1998\)](#page-19-23).

Overall, Equation [\(3\)](#page-4-2) depends on the elemental partial pressures, with 6 unknowns, corresponding to the 6 elements considered. Nominally, we solve for these using the 5 equations in [\(2\)](#page-4-0) for all elements apart from H, together with

$$
P_s = \sum_{i \in \mathbf{X}} p_i, \tag{5}
$$

to fix the total pressure. This treatment of oxygen yields a first-order estimate of the redox state as set by the atmosphere. Alternately, we consider oxygen fugacity (f_{O_2}) as a free parameter, by determining p_{O} in Equa-tion [\(3\)](#page-4-2) via $f_{\text{O}_2} = p_{\text{O}_2} = K_{\text{O}_2} p_{\text{O}}^2 / p^*$, allowing us to

Figure 3. Left: Pressure in the H_2 -rich envelope against the envelope mass fraction above this pressure level. Solid and dashed lines show these assuming C2 and the profile used by S24 in the envelope respectively. The black squares indicate expected surface conditions for different envelope mass fractions, independent of satisfying the bulk properties of the planet. Right: The nominal pressure-temperature profiles generated for this work and S24 shown against the liquidus and solidus for peridotite [\(Fiquet et al.](#page-19-20) [2010;](#page-19-20) [Monteux et al.](#page-20-14) [2016\)](#page-20-14). The solid and liquid phases are shaded. The black squares again show the corresponding surface conditions expected for the different envelope mass fractions.

consider different redox conditions. In this framework, we assume ideal gas behavior such that fugacity and partial pressure are equivalent (e.g. [Bower et al.](#page-19-24) [2022;](#page-19-24) [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [2022\)](#page-21-6).

As a cross-check, we validate our new framework against a self-consistent atmosphere composition model (e.g. [Schaefer & Fegley](#page-21-9) [2017\)](#page-21-9) which uses the Gibbs energy minimization code IVTANTHERMO [\(Belov](#page-18-3) [et al.](#page-18-3) [1999\)](#page-18-3). IVTANTHERMO uses a thermodynamic database based on [Gurvich & Veyts](#page-19-25) [\(1990\)](#page-19-25), which we modify to include the silicate-melt dissolved volatile species H₂, OH⁻, O²⁻, CO, CO₂, CH₄, N³⁻, and S²⁻. We calculate equilibrium between a total possible 366 gas species and 201 condensed species. For the dissolution reactions, we assume $\Delta C_p = 0$ and that any temperature dependence in the equilibrium constant is due to the heat of the reaction. However, data is available only in limited temperature ranges for most dissolution reactions, so we assume a simple Henry's law solubility relation for all of the dissolved species except S^{2-} , OH^- , H_2 , and CH_4 . We also neglect non-ideality in both the gas phase and melt. Using IVTANTHERMO, we then compute self-consistent equilibrium between the gas phase and melt species as a function of pressure and temperature.

For this comparison, we use $50 \times \text{solar bulk element}$ tal abundances (not including He), $P_s = 10^4$ bar, $T_s = 3000$ K, and $M_{\text{melt}}/M_{\text{atm}} = 0.20$, which is given by the gas-to-melt mass ratio as calculated by IV-TANTHERMO. We find that all major H-C-N-O-S gas species agree to within at most 0.35 dex (standard deviation of 0.1 dex), with the largest deviation coming from $CO₂$. This deviation mostly stems from the oxygen fugacities being somewhat different between the two approaches, with IVTANTHERMO yielding a 0.35 dex lower value. Furthermore, we verify that we recover the atmospheric abundances given by FASTCHEM 2 [\(Stock](#page-21-18) [et al.](#page-21-18) [2022\)](#page-21-18) and GGCHEM [\(Woitke et al.](#page-21-19) [2018\)](#page-21-19) when setting $M_{\text{melt}} = 0$.

2.4. Atmospheric Chemistry

We carry out equilibrium and disequilibrium chemistry calculations to determine the atmospheric composition above the magma/rock surface. We use the VULCAN photochemical kinetics framework [\(Tsai](#page-21-20) [et al.](#page-21-20) [2021\)](#page-21-20), with the initial atmospheric chemistry obtained using the FASTCHEM equilibrium chemistry code [\(Stock et al.](#page-21-17) [2018\)](#page-21-17).

For equilibrium chemistry calculations, we consider thermochemical equilibrium involving H-C-N-O-S species as well as He, along with H_2O condensation. For calculations considering disequilibrium processes, we additionally include the effects of vertical mixing and photochemistry. We follow the K_{zz} parameterisation of [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-12) [\(2023a\)](#page-20-12):

$$
K_{\rm zz}/{\rm cm}^2 {\rm s}^{-1} = \begin{cases} \min(\frac{5.6 \times 10^4}{(P/{\rm bar})^{\frac{1}{2}}}, 10^{10}), & P \le 0.5 \text{ bar} \\ 10^6, & P > 0.5 \text{ bar}, \end{cases}
$$
(6)

although we note that the K_{zz} in the troposphere could be higher (e.g., $\sim 10^7 - 10^8$ cm² s⁻¹ in the deep convective region of the atmosphere) or lower (e.g., $\sim 10^4$ $\text{cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$) in any radiative regions if moist convection is inhibited by the high molecular weight of water in the H2-rich atmosphere (see [Leconte et al.](#page-20-18) [2024\)](#page-20-18). Accordingly, we consider a wider range of K_{zz} values than our canonical treatment in Section [4.5](#page-15-0) and Appendix [B.](#page-24-0)

Additionally, we consider photochemical reactions including H-C-N-O-S species, using a nominal stellar spectrum from the HAZMAT spectral library [\(Peacock et al.](#page-20-19) [2020\)](#page-20-19) corresponding to a median 5 Gyr star of radius 0.45 R_{\odot} following previous work [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-12) [2023a\)](#page-20-12). We also specifically consider the condensation of H_2O to liquid and solid droplets, which fall at their terminal velocity, as described in [Tsai et al.](#page-21-20) [\(2021\)](#page-21-20). We note that while the H-C-N-O chemistry has been extensively explored for sub-Neptunes in various studies (e.g. [Yu et al.](#page-21-21) [2021;](#page-21-21) [Hu et al.](#page-20-20) [2021;](#page-20-20) [Tsai et al.](#page-21-20) [2021;](#page-21-20) [Mad](#page-20-12)[husudhan et al.](#page-20-12) [2023a\)](#page-20-12), the S chemistry has not been explored in significant detail and may be incomplete. Nevertheless, we include S using the VULCAN framework [\(Tsai et al.](#page-21-20) [2021\)](#page-21-20) for completeness.

With the above calculations we obtain the vertical mixing ratio profiles for a number of relevant chemical species in the atmosphere. The abundances of key species in the observable part of the atmosphere can then be compared against constraint retrieved from an atmospheric spectrum.

2.5. Spectral Characteristics

We use the results of the chemistry calculation described in Section [2.4](#page-5-1) to simulate how such an atmosphere would appear in transmission spectroscopy, including the spectral contributions of relevant species. For this, we use the forward model generating component of the VIRA retrieval framework [\(Constanti](#page-19-26)[nou & Madhusudhan](#page-19-26) [2024\)](#page-19-26), which treats the planet's terminator as a 1D atmosphere in hydrostatic equilibrium. We consider atmospheric opacity contributions from $H₂O$ [\(Barber et al.](#page-18-4) [2006;](#page-18-4) [Rothman et al.](#page-21-22) [2010\)](#page-21-22), $CH₄$ [\(Yurchenko & Tennyson](#page-21-23) [2014\)](#page-21-23), NH₃ [\(Yurchenko](#page-21-24) [et al.](#page-21-24) [2011\)](#page-21-24), CO [\(Li et al.](#page-20-21) [2015\)](#page-20-21), $CO₂$ [\(Tashkun et al.](#page-21-25) [2015\)](#page-21-25), C_2H_2 [\(Chubb et al.](#page-19-27) [2020\)](#page-19-27), HCN [\(Barber et al.](#page-18-5) [2014\)](#page-18-5), H2S [\(Azzam et al.](#page-18-6) [2016;](#page-18-6) [Chubb et al.](#page-19-28) [2018\)](#page-19-28) and $SO₂$ [\(Underwood et al.](#page-21-26) [2016\)](#page-21-26). We do not include $N₂$ in the model, as it has no significant absorption features

in the near-infrared and it is not present in significant enough quantities to affect the atmospheric mean molecular weight. We additionally consider atmospheric extinction arising from H_2-H_2 and H_2-He collision-induced absorption [\(Borysow et al.](#page-18-7) [1988;](#page-18-7) [Orton et al.](#page-20-22) [2007;](#page-20-22) [Abel](#page-18-8) [et al.](#page-18-8) [2011;](#page-18-8) [Richard et al.](#page-21-27) [2012\)](#page-21-27), which provide the spectral baseline, as well as H_2 Rayleigh scattering. We simulate transmission spectra using the vertical mixing ratio profiles computed using VULCAN as described above, and the P-T profile appropriate to each case considered.

3. RESULTS: COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS WORK

We now apply the framework described in Section [2](#page-2-0) and compare with previous works on both terrestrial-like and sub-Neptune atmospheres.

3.1. Terrestrial-like Atmospheres

Many previous studies have investigated surfaceatmosphere interactions for magma oceans underneath terrestrial-like atmospheres (e.g., [Matsui & Abe](#page-20-23) [1986;](#page-20-23) [Elkins-Tanton](#page-19-29) [2008;](#page-19-29) [Hamano et al.](#page-19-30) [2013;](#page-19-30) [Lebrun et al.](#page-20-24) [2013;](#page-20-24) [Wordsworth](#page-21-28) [2016;](#page-21-28) [Kite & Schaefer](#page-20-25) [2021;](#page-20-25) [Licht](#page-20-26)[enberg et al.](#page-20-26) [2021;](#page-20-26) [Bower et al.](#page-19-24) [2022;](#page-19-24) [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [2022\)](#page-19-12). Recent studies have explored the implications of diverse interiors of exoplanets for their atmospheric compositions. [Daviau & Lee](#page-19-11) [\(2021\)](#page-19-11) proposed that, for reduced conditions, nitrogen is expected to be preferentially sequestered in the mantle, providing a valuable way to study the interior composition of such exoplanets. More recently, [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12) investigated the primordial distribution of volatiles within the framework of melt-atmosphere interactions and discussed applications for Venus and Earth. For the early Earth, they find that reduced conditions, with oxygen fugacity two dex below the iron-wüstite (IW) buffer, $f_{\text{O}_2} \lesssim \text{IW} - 2$, result in an atmosphere abundant in H_2 , CO and CH₄ but depleted in CO_2 and N_2 . On the other hand, for $f_{\text{O}_2} \gtrsim \text{IW} + 2$, CO₂ becomes the main atmospheric component, with significant levels of SO_2 , N_2 and H_2O . In particular, the behaviour of nitrogen is a consequence of the high solubility of N_2 as N^{3-} in silicate melt at reducing conditions (e.g., [Libourel et al.](#page-20-27) [2003;](#page-20-27) [Dasgupta](#page-19-16) [et al.](#page-19-16) [2022\)](#page-19-16), via the following reaction

$$
\frac{1}{2}N_{2\,\mathrm{(gas)}}+\frac{3}{2}O^{2-}{}_{\mathrm{(melt)}}\,\rightleftharpoons\,N^{3-}{}_{\mathrm{(melt)}}+\frac{3}{4}O_{2\,\mathrm{(gas)}}\,. \quad (7)
$$

As a result, the melt concentration of N^{3-} is proportional to $f_{N_0}^{1/2}$ $\frac{1}{2} f_{O_2}^{-3/4}$ $\int_{\text{O}_2}^{\text{O}_2/4}$, thus favouring low f_{O_2} . In conclusion, these works predict that the abundance of atmospheric nitrogen may be used as a diagnostic for the redox state of a rocky planet's mantle.

As a benchmark, we compare our melt-atmosphere equilibrium chemistry framework with [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12). We use their case with a magma ocean mass of half the bulk silicate mantle at $T = 1773$ K and with volatile contents of 90, 102, 3.3, and 126 ppm-wt for C, H, N, and S, respectively. With this, we reproduce their atmospheric composition as shown in Figure [4.](#page-7-0) Compared to our nominal setup in Section [2.3,](#page-4-3) we added a constraint for the hydrogen abundance and solved for the resulting mass of the atmosphere, coupled to the surface pressure using [\(Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [2022\)](#page-19-12)

$$
P_s = \frac{gM_{\text{atm}}}{4\pi R_{\text{p}}^2} \,,\tag{8}
$$

where g is the gravitational acceleration at R_p . For a like-to-like comparison, we added the condensation of graphite and used the same gas species (excluding Ar) and solubility laws as [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12). Overall, we find good agreement between both implementations, with the most deviation coming from N_2 and CH₄. We find that the N_2 discrepancy comes from an inconsistency in the code by [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12), whereby they use a molar mass of 14 g/mol for N_2 instead of 28 g/mol. The remaining discrepancy is likely a result of minor differences in the implementations of the different reactions. We find that by accounting for some of these differences we can better match the result by [Gaillard](#page-19-12) [et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12), as shown in Figure [4.](#page-7-0) For this purpose, in addition to considering their adopted molar mass, we implemented the reactions $\text{CH}_4 + 2\text{O}_2 \rightleftharpoons 2\text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{CO}_2$ and $H_2O \rightleftharpoons 0.5O_2 + H_2$ using the equilibrium constants by [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12) to obtain the partial pressures of CH_4 and H_2O , instead of deriving these from the elemental partial pressures as described in Section [2.3.](#page-4-3) We also used the oxygen fugacity of the IW buffer from [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12) instead of [Hirschmann](#page-19-31) [\(2021\)](#page-19-31).

3.2. Sub-Neptunes with H_2 -rich Atmospheres

Several recent studies have also explored magmaatmosphere interactions in sub-Neptunes with rocky interiors and H_2 -rich atmospheres. [Kite et al.](#page-20-9) (2019) considered the impact of H_2 solubility in silicate melts on the radius distribution of sub-Neptunes, addressing the radius cliff, a sharp decline in the abundance of planets with $R_p \gtrsim 3R_{\oplus}$. They find that the high solubility of H² in magma, especially at high pressure, limits the maximum radius that can be attained by sub-Neptunes through accretion of atmospheric H₂. For a 10 M_{\oplus} core they find a limiting mass fraction of 1.5 wt% H_2 in the atmosphere – corresponding to > 20 wt% H_2 in the planet –, as any additional H_2 would be stored almost exclusively in the interior. Looking at smaller planets

Figure 4. Comparison with [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12), showing the atmospheric composition as a function of oxygen fugacity. The solid lines show the partial pressures from our melt-atmosphere framework, described in Section [2.3.](#page-4-3) The transparent lines are computed using the code from [Gaillard](#page-19-12) [et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12), and the dashed lines are computed with our framework modified to approximate the results from [Gail](#page-19-12)[lard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12). The dotted line at the top illustrates the total surface pressure.

 $(2 R_{\oplus} \leq R_{\rm p} \leq 3 R_{\oplus}),$ [Kite et al.](#page-20-10) [\(2020\)](#page-20-10) find that magma-atmosphere interactions would significantly affect the atmosphere's composition and mass. For example, a key insight is that the H_2O/H_2 ratio in the atmosphere reflects not only external water delivery, but also water production as a result of atmosphere-magma interactions. This would make the H_2O/H_2 a good diagnostic for atmospheric origin, as well as for magma composition. In particular, it is found to be proportional to the magma FeO content.

Further investigations were carried out by [Schlicht](#page-21-6)[ing & Young](#page-21-6) [\(2022\)](#page-21-6), [Charnoz et al.](#page-19-13) [\(2023\)](#page-19-13) and, most recently, [Falco et al.](#page-19-14) [\(2024\)](#page-19-14). Considering a surface temperature $T_s = 4500$ K, 1% to 14% H mass fractions (of overall planet mass) and model parameters resulting in f_{O_2} ≤ IW − 2, [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [\(2022\)](#page-21-6) find that the atmosphere is expected to be dominated across the explored parameter space by H² , SiO, CO, Mg and Na, followed by H_2O , which should exceed CO_2 and $CH₄$ by two to three orders of magnitude. It should be noted they do not include N in their model. [Charnoz](#page-19-13) [et al.](#page-19-13) [\(2023\)](#page-19-13) and [Falco et al.](#page-19-14) [\(2024\)](#page-19-14), instead, consider total hydrogen pressures ranging between 10^{-6} and 10^{6} bar, temperatures between 1800 and 3500 K, and do not include any volatiles in their calculations, but also show that detectable absorption features of H_2O and SiO should be expected. Additionally, the volatile-free investigation by [Misener et al.](#page-20-11) [\(2023\)](#page-20-11) finds that silane

(SiH⁴) should also be expected, dominating over SiO at $P \geq 0.1$ bar for an isothermal $T = 1000$ K pressuretemperature $(P-T)$ profile in the upper atmosphere. Most recently, [Tian & Heng](#page-21-11) [\(2024\)](#page-21-11) also investigated the outgassing mechanism for hybrid atmospheres in sub-Neptunes, but without considering solubilities in magma.

3.3. End-member Scenario of K2-18 b

Some of the principles described above were recently applied to the habitable-zone sub-Neptune K2-18 b by [Shorttle et al.](#page-21-10) [\(2024\)](#page-21-10), hereafter S24. Similarly to [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12) and [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) (2022), S24 point to a high CO/CO_2 ratio and, like [Daviau &](#page-19-11) [Lee](#page-19-11) [\(2021\)](#page-19-11) and [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12), a depletion in atmospheric N as signatures for the presence of a magma ocean and/or a reduced interior. It should be noted that the case of K2-18 b constitutes an end-member scenario. While most of the work on magma oceans has focused on very hot planets (e.g., [Kite et al.](#page-20-28) [2016;](#page-20-28) [Schaefer et al.](#page-21-8) [2016;](#page-21-8) [Kite et al.](#page-20-10) [2020;](#page-20-10) [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [2022;](#page-19-12) [Charnoz et al.](#page-19-13) [2023;](#page-19-13) [Misener et al.](#page-20-11) [2023;](#page-20-11) [Falco et al.](#page-19-14) [2024\)](#page-19-14), K2-18 b is a temperate sub-Neptune with equilibrium temperature $T_{\text{eq}} = 272 \text{ K}$ (assuming an albedo of 0.3), close to that of the Earth. Here, we assess the findings of S24 using the framework described in Section [2](#page-2-0) and Figure [1.](#page-2-1)

We briefly note that in addition to gas dwarf and Hycean world scenarios, a mini-Neptune scenario with a thick H2-rich atmosphere has also been proposed for K2-18 b (e.g. [Hu et al.](#page-20-20) [2021;](#page-20-20) [Wogan et al.](#page-21-29) [2024\)](#page-21-29). [Wogan](#page-21-29) [et al.](#page-21-29) [\(2024\)](#page-21-29) conduct photochemical modelling of mini-Neptune cases for K2-18 b, suggesting a plausible solution. However, as noted in [Glein](#page-19-32) [\(2024\)](#page-19-32), the calculated abundances are unable to match the retrieved abundances [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2). In particular, the mixing ratios of CO and NH³ are too large compared to the retrieved abundances, and so is the $CO/CO₂$ ratio.

3.3.1. Consistency with bulk parameters

At the outset, it is important to ensure that any assumption about the internal structure is consistent with the planetary bulk parameters. Previous studies have shown that the bulk parameters of K2-18 b allow a degenerate set of solutions between a mini-Neptune, a Hycean world, or a rocky world with a thick H_2 -rich atmosphere, i.e. a gas dwarf [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-0) [2020,](#page-20-0) [2021;](#page-20-1) [Rigby & Madhusudhan](#page-21-3) [2024\)](#page-21-3). Considering the present gas dwarf scenario, a purely rocky interior would require a minimum H_2 -rich envelope mass fraction of ∼1% [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-0) [2020\)](#page-20-0), as discussed below.

The model grid of S24 contains four values of mantle mass fraction relative to the total planet mass (0.001, 0.01, 0.1, and 1) and five values of the hydrogen mass fraction relative to the mantle mass (1, 10, 100, 1000 and 10000 ppm). Firstly, all the cases with a mantle mass fraction of 1 violate mass balance, as the sum of the mantle and atmospheric masses would exceed the total planet mass. Secondly, for the gas dwarf scenario, as noted above, the bulk density of K2-18 b requires an H_2 rich atmosphere with a minimum mass fraction of \sim 1%. In the S24 model grid, there is only one model which has an atmospheric mass fraction of 1%, and it corresponds to a mantle mass fraction of 1, as noted above. It follows that all the remaining cases, with H_2 mass fraction below 1%, are incompatible with the planet's bulk density.

In order to estimate the allowed atmospheric mass fractions for K2-18 b in the gas dwarf scenario, we consider four possible interior compositions, illustrated in Table [1:](#page-10-1) $f_{\text{silicate}} = 100\%,$ Earth-like $(f_{\text{silicate}} = 67\%),$ Mercury-like $(f_{\text{silicate}} = 30\%)$ and $f_{\text{silicate}} = 5\%$, where f_{silicate} is the mass fraction of the interior (i.e. excluding the envelope) in the silicate mantle. We include $f_{\text{silicate}} = 5\%$ as an end-member case, close to the upper limit for the allowed envelope mass fraction. Similarly, the extreme pure-silicate interior case is included as an end-member, yielding the lower limit on the allowed envelope mass fraction for a gas dwarf scenario. We adopt the median planetary mass $M_{\rm p} = 8.63 \, {\rm M}_{\oplus}$ [\(Cloutier et al.](#page-19-33) [2019\)](#page-19-33) and radius $R_p = 2.61 \text{ R}_\oplus$ [\(Ben](#page-18-9)[neke et al.](#page-18-9) [2019\)](#page-18-9) of K2-18 b. The allowed envelope mass also depends on the choice of $P-T$ profile, with hotter profiles leading to lower envelope masses for a given interior composition, as shown in Table [1.](#page-10-1)

Considering the four self-consistent P-T profiles described in Section [2.1,](#page-2-2) we find that an envelope mass fraction $x_{\text{env}} \geq 1.34\%$ is required for consistency with the bulk parameters. This limit corresponds to the extreme case of a 100 % silicate interior, adopting C4 for the envelope P-T profile. For a like-to-like comparison with the S24 model grid, we also consider their P-T profile, which is the profile from [Benneke et al.](#page-18-9) [\(2019\)](#page-18-9) log-linearly extrapolated to higher pressures. For this profile, we find envelope mass fractions of $x_{\text{env}} \geq 0.90\%$ are required, again corresponding to the extreme 100 % silicate interior case. Overall, we find that all the models in the model grid of S24 are incompatible with mass balance and/or the bulk density of the planet considered. We demonstrate a self-consistent approach of accounting for the observed bulk parameters of K2-18 b in such calculations in Section [4.](#page-10-0)

3.3.2. Feasibility of a magma ocean

As described in Section [2.2](#page-3-0) and shown in Figure [3,](#page-5-0) given an interior composition, the choice of P-T profile

affects the resulting envelope mass fraction. This, in turn, determines the surface pressure and temperature and the liquid/solid phase of the rocky surface underneath. Therefore, it is important to consider a physically motivated P-T profile in the envelope. As mentioned above, S24 consider the P-T profile from [Benneke et al.](#page-18-9) [\(2019\)](#page-18-9) at low pressures ($P \leq 4$ bar) and perform a loglinear extrapolation to the deep atmosphere ($P \gtrsim 10^5$) bar). The resulting temperature gradient can be significantly different from other self-consistent model P-T profiles for the H_2 -rich envelope (e.g., [Hu](#page-20-29) [2021;](#page-20-29) [Mad](#page-20-12)[husudhan et al.](#page-20-12) [2023a;](#page-20-12) [Leconte et al.](#page-20-18) [2024\)](#page-20-18); an example is shown in Figure [3.](#page-5-0)

We also note, however, that the actual surface temperature at the magma-atmosphere interface (T_s) used in S24 appears to be a free parameter rather than selfconsistently determined from their $P-T$ profile. The T_s ranges between 1500 K and 3000 K, but the corresponding pressure is not clear, considering their assertion that the maximum surface pressure allowed by the model is 10^8 bar. This pressure also appears to be inconsistent with their maximum envelope mass fraction of 1%. Across the range of rocky compositions we consider, the maximum pressure reached is \sim 5-7×10⁵ bar for envelope mass fractions \sim 5-7% depending on the P-T profile as shown in Table [1](#page-10-1) and Figure [3.](#page-5-0)

Nevertheless, in order to establish the feasibility of achieving melt conditions in the S24 model, we consider the five highest envelope mass fractions used in S24. We adopt their mantle mass fraction of 1 and the corresponding five H_2 mass fractions in their model grid, with a maximum of 1%. We then use these envelope mass fractions and the S24 P-T profile to determine the corresponding expected surface pressures and temperatures, independent of satisfying the planetary bulk properties. These model points are shown in Figure [3](#page-5-0) along with the liquidus and solidus curves for peridotite [\(Fi](#page-19-20)[quet et al.](#page-19-20) [2010;](#page-19-20) [Monteux et al.](#page-20-14) [2016\)](#page-20-14). We find that only two of these five cases result in a magma surface in our framework. Finally, since we considered only the five highest envelope mass fractions of S24, it follows that all of the other models would also be unlikely to result in melt. We further note that for the two cases that result in a magma surface in S24, the magma mass fraction they consider is equal to the planet mass. However, based on the temperature structures shown in Figure [5,](#page-11-0) we find that the maximum magma mass fraction across the different interior compositions is ∼13%, potentially somewhat higher as a result of partial melting, but not 100%.

3.3.3. Magma-atmosphere interactions

If the plausibility of a magma ocean is established, the melt-atmosphere interaction must be considered to determine its effect on the atmospheric composition. As described in Section [2.3,](#page-4-3) the gas phase composition depends on the pressure and temperature at the interface, the elemental abundances, the amount of magma available, the solubilities of the chemical species, and the chemical properties of the melt.

For the case of K2-18 b, S24 consider oxygen fugacity as a free parameter and assess the abundances of several H-C-N-O species in the lower atmosphere following melt-atmosphere interactions. They determine the atmospheric composition by considering three reactions, $CO_2 + 2H_2 \rightleftharpoons CH_4 + O_2$, $2CO_2 \rightleftharpoons 2CO + O_2$, and $2H_2O \rightleftharpoons 2H_2 + O_2$, in thermochemical equilibrium, and solubilities of CH_4 , N_2 , CO_2 , and H_2O in the magma. However, we note that these reactions do not encompass all the prominent H-C-N-O molecules at the considered conditions. In particular, $NH₃$ is expected to be the dominant N-bearing species at the base of the atmosphere. By not including $NH₃$ and its equilibrium with N_2 and H_2 , S24 may be overestimating the nitrogen depletion in the atmosphere, given that all of the nitrogen is assumed to be in N_2 , which is very soluble in magma at reducing conditions, as we show in Figure [9](#page-25-0) in Appendix [A.](#page-22-0)

In our framework, described in Section [2.3,](#page-4-3) we find that nitrogen depletion in the atmosphere increases by several orders of magnitude by not including NH3. Ultimately, this highlights the importance of the completeness of the reactions and solubilities considered. Finally, we note that it is also possible to not have significant N depletion even in the presence of a molten surface depending on the pressure and temperature, as shown in Table [1.](#page-10-1)

3.3.4. Atmospheric composition and observables

The properties at the surface determine the composition in the upper layers of the atmosphere, and hence its observable characteristics. These are strongly influenced by model assumptions on elemental abundances. S24 allow the C/H ratio to vary between $0.01 \times$ solar and $100\times$ solar, while keeping the N/H ratio fixed to solar, i.e., N/H = 6.76×10^{-5} by number. This itself limits the NH₃ log-mixing ratio to at most log $X_{\text{NH}_3} \sim -4$, close to the upper bound of −4.46 found by [Madhusud](#page-20-2)[han et al.](#page-20-2) [\(2023b\)](#page-20-2), and biases the model by construction to allow for up to $100\times$ more (or down to $100\times$ fewer) C-based molecules than N-based ones. The dependence of the S24 model outcomes on the choice of C/H values is not reported. It should be noted that a $100\times$ enhancement or depletion of C/H without any change in

$P-T$	$f_{\rm silicate}$	x_{interior}	x_{env}	$T_{\rm s}$	$P_{\rm s}$	$x_{\rm melt}$	C/H	N/H	O/H	S/H
Profile	$(\% \text{ of interior})$	$(\%)$	$(\%)$	(K)	(10^5 bar)	$(\%)$	(\log)	(\log)	(\log)	(log)
C1	5	93.01	6.99	3278	6.52	$\overline{0}$	-1.84	-2.47	-1.61	-3.18
	30	94.35	5.65	3120	3.99	$\overline{0}$	-1.84	-2.47	-1.61	-3.18
	67	95.91	4.09	2928	2.15	0.86	-1.84	-4.54	-1.65	-3.21
	100	97.10	2.90	2664	1.23	2.02	-1.84	-3.51	-1.70	-3.25
C2	5	93.40	6.60	3461	6.27	$\overline{0}$	-1.84	-2.47	-1.61	-3.18
	30	94.71	5.29	3290	3.79	$\overline{0}$	-1.84	-2.47	-1.61	-3.18
	67	96.24	3.76	3084	2.00	1.81	-1.84	-4.36	-1.69	-3.25
	100	97.38	2.62	2819	1.12	3.16	-1.83	-3.34	-1.76	-3.32
C ₃	5	94.94	5.06	4503	5.05	2.62	-1.83	-6.43	-1.75	-3.33
	30	96.17	3.83	4200	2.83	5.78	-1.83	-4.86	-1.89	-3.56
	67	97.48	2.52	3870	1.36	10.16	-1.83	-3.67	-2.07	-3.94
	100	98.38	1.62	3512	0.70	11.91	-1.82	-3.13	-2.15	-4.18
C ₄	5	95.43	4.57	4601	4.68	3.65	-1.83	-6.16	-1.81	-3.41
	30	96.61	3.39	4281	2.56	7.43	-1.83	-4.69	-1.98	-3.72
	67	97.84	2.16	3910	1.19	11.67	-1.82	-3.59	-2.15	-4.13
	100	98.66	1.34	3506	0.59	12.53	-1.81	-3.10	-2.21	-4.33

Table 1. H/He envelope mass fraction, resulting surface temperature, pressure, melt mass fraction constrained by the median values of the K2-18 b bulk parameters ($R_p = 2.61 \text{ R}_\oplus$, $M_p = 8.63 \text{ M}_\oplus$), and atmospheric elemental abundances. We use four interior compositions, where 5% and 100% silicate are unrealistic extreme cases included for completeness, and the four self-consistent P-T profiles generated for this work. We note that the cases with 0% may include a region of partial melt. The bulk elemental abundances in the melt and atmosphere combined are set to 50×solar.

N may be difficult to reconcile with potential formation mechanisms.

We note two further points regarding the abundance of C- and N-bearing species predicted by S24. Firstly, S24 appear to indicate that the total abundances of carbon in their models reach up to 3.8 wt% of the planet mass. It is, however, unclear how this may be compatible with their assumptions of a C/H ratio of at most $100\times$ solar and an H mass fraction $\leq 1\%$, given they adopt the [Asplund et al.](#page-18-10) [\(2009\)](#page-18-10) value for $(C/H)_{\odot}$, i.e., 3.2×10^{-3} by mass. Secondly, as argued in Section [3.3.2,](#page-8-0) only the largest atmospheric mass fractions S24 consider can potentially lead to a magma ocean. At the resulting surface pressures, however, their model predicts a logmixing ratio for CO_2 of log $X_{CO_2} \lesssim -3$. This is at the lowest end, if not outside, of the 1σ confidence interval presented in [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [\(2023b\)](#page-20-2). Furthermore, the CO abundance or the $CO₂/CO$ ratio are not reported in S24, making it difficult to assess the validity of the chemical estimates.

Finally, S24 argue that the model spectra from their model ensemble provide a qualitatively reasonable match to the data. Even if the model spectra were taken at face value, the lack of a reported goodness-of-fit metric precludes a reliable assessment of the match to data. More generally, a limited grid of forward models is insufficient to robustly explore the full model space taking into account all the degeneracies involved in an atmospheric spectral model and to obtain a statistically robust fit to the data; that is the purpose of atmospheric retrievals [\(Madhusudhan](#page-20-30) [2018\)](#page-20-30). A more reliable approach in the present context is to compare the model-predicted chemical abundances with the abundance constraints obtained from robust atmospheric retrievals of the observed spectra. As discussed above, the cases of S24 with the highest surface pressure, i.e. those that may allow a magma surface, still predict lower CO² abundances than those retrieved for K2-18 b [\(Mad](#page-20-2)[husudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2). The CO and H_2O abundances are not reported in S24, which prevents a clear assessment of the agreement between the chemical predictions and the retrieved abundances.

4. RESULTS: A CASE STUDY OF K2-18 b

After having established the consistency of our results with [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12), and having discussed the S24 findings for K2-18 b, we proceed to apply our framework ex novo. We do so for K2-18 b in the present section, starting, as outlined in Figure [1,](#page-2-1) with internal and atmospheric structure modelling that ensures consistency with the known bulk parameters. Through considering magma-atmosphere interactions, equilibrium chemistry in the lower atmosphere and non-equilibrium processes in the upper atmosphere, we make predictions for the observable composition and spectral signatures of a sub-Neptune magma world.

Figure 5. Atmospheric pressure-temperature profiles shown against the adopted phase boundary for the silicate mantle, with the dashed lines corresponding to the [Monteux et al.](#page-20-14) [\(2016\)](#page-20-14) liquidus and solidus for peridotite. The black circles indicate the surface conditions for the cases discussed and the coloured lines show the adiabatic temperature structure in the melt, adopting the liquidus as the melt-solid transition.

4.1. Atmospheric Structure

As discussed in Section [2.1,](#page-2-2) the dayside atmospheric structure is calculated self-consistently from the atmospheric constraints retrieved in the one-offset case of [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [\(2023b\)](#page-20-2): the median $\log X_{\text{CH}_4}$ = -1.74 , $\log X_{\text{CO}_2} = -2.04$, and the 2σ upper bound $\log X_{\text{H}_2\text{O}} = -3.01$. The *P-T* profile depends on a wide range of parameters, not all of which are observationally well-constrained: these include the internal temperature T_{int} , the properties of clouds/hazes if present, and the efficiency of day-night heat redistribution. A detailed exploration of the temperature profiles in deep H_2 -rich sub-Neptune atmospheres has been carried out before, in [Piette & Madhusudhan](#page-21-13) [\(2020\)](#page-21-13). Here, we assume uniform day-night heat redistribution, and consider four cases for the P-T profiles, varying the internal temperature T_{int} and the Rayleigh enhancement factor (a) for the hazes: C1, corresponding to $T_{\text{int}} = 25 \text{ K}, a = 10000;$ C2 and C3, both with $a = 1500$, with $T_{\text{int}} = 25$ K and $T_{\text{int}} = 50$ K, respectively; C4, with $T_{\text{int}} = 50$ K and $a = 100$. We note that, in principle, even colder profiles are plausible, given the clouds/haze properties retrieved from observations [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2). All the P-T profiles are shown in Figure [5.](#page-11-0)

4.2. Internal Structure

For each of these profiles, we obtain the permitted H_2 -rich envelope mass fraction (x_{env}) and corresponding surface conditions (P_s, T_s) based on the bulk properties of the planet, as discussed in Sections [2.2](#page-3-0) and [3.3.1](#page-8-1) and shown in Table [1.](#page-10-1) We vary the interior composition from $f_{\text{silicate}} = 5\%$ to $f_{\text{silicate}} = 100\%$, adopting the median $M_{\rm p} = 8.63$ M_⊕ [\(Cloutier et al.](#page-19-33) [2019\)](#page-19-33) and $R_{\rm p} = 2.61$ R_⊕ [\(Benneke et al.](#page-18-9) [2019\)](#page-18-9). We note that the pure silicate and 95% iron $(f_{silicate} = 5%)$ interior cases are unrealistic end-member interior compositions, but we consider them for completeness. We adopt $P_0 = 0.05$ bar as the outer boundary condition for the internal structure modelling, corresponding to the pressure at R_p , based on [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-0) [\(2020\)](#page-20-0).

In Figure [5](#page-11-0) we show the P-T profiles considered, along with the surface conditions (black circles) and adiabatic profiles in the melt for our nominal C2 and C3 scenarios, which we further discuss below. The results for all P-T profiles are given in Table [1.](#page-10-1)

The presence and amount of magma depend on the adopted P-T profile. We start by considering one of the colder profiles, C2. For an Earth-like interior, we find $x_{\text{env}} = 3.76\%,$ with surface conditions $P_s =$ 2.00×10^5 bar and $T_s = 3084$ K. The melt mass fraction (x_{melt}) in this case is 1.81%. For a Mercury-like interior, i.e. with higher Fe content, we find $x_{env} = 5.29\%$, with surface conditions $P_s = 3.79 \times 10^5$ bar and $T_s = 3290$ K. Based on our assumption of the liquidus as the melt curve, we class this as having 0% melt in Table [1.](#page-10-1) In reality, these surface conditions lie between the liquidus and solidus, which would lead to a partially molten surface. This is also the case for the $f_{silicate} = 5\%$ interior, with $x_{\text{env}} = 6.60\%$, with surface conditions $P_{\rm s} = 6.27 \times 10^5$ bar and $T_{\rm s} = 3461$ K. On the other hand, for the extreme case of a pure silicate interior, we find a melt mass fraction of 3.16%, for $x_{\text{env}} = 2.62\%$, $P_{\rm s}=1.12\times 10^5$ bar and $T_{\rm s}=2819$ K.

We next consider the higher-temperature $P-T$ profile C3, which permits solutions with a magma ocean surface for all the interior compositions considered. For each interior composition, the permitted envelope mass fraction, and hence the surface pressure, is lower for this hotter P-T profile. For an Earth-like interior, we find $x_{env} = 2.52\%$, with surface conditions $P_s =$ 1.36×10^5 bar and $T_s = 3870$ K. The melt mass fraction in this case is 10.16%. For a Mercury-like interior, we find $x_{env} = 3.83\%$, with surface conditions $P_s = 2.83 \times 10^5$ bar and $T_s = 4200$ K. The corresponding x_{melt} is 5.78%. For the extreme case of a pure silicate interior, we find a lower $x_{env} = 1.62\%$, with $P_{\rm s} = 6.97 \times 10^4$ bar and $T_{\rm s} = 3512$ K. The melt mass fraction in this case is larger, at 11.91%. For the other extreme of $f_{\text{silicate}} = 5\%$, we obtain $x_{\text{env}} = 5.06\%$, for $P_{\rm s}$ = 5.05 × 10⁵ bar and $T_{\rm s}$ = 4503 K, with $x_{\rm melt}$ = 2.62%. We note that including modelling of partial melt

would somewhat increase the melt mass fraction in all cases.

As shown in Table 1, the envelope mass fractions and surface conditions we find for profiles C1 and C4 are very similar to C2 and C3 respectively. This is despite the differences in envelope temperature structure resulting from differing haze properties; the difference between C2 and C3 is primarily due to the differing T_{int} .

4.3. Volatile Abundances at the Interface

At the surface-atmosphere interface, the interactions between the gas phase equilibrium reactions and solubility of the gases in the magma, if any is present, drive the elemental abundances in the atmosphere. We consider the four P-T profiles presented in Table [1](#page-10-1) and assume 50×solar metallicity, using solar abundances by [Asplund](#page-18-11) [et al.](#page-18-11) [\(2021\)](#page-18-11). The assumed metallicity is approximately based on the median retrieved CH_4 abundance for K2-18 b [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2). Across all considered cases, we find that the dominant H-C-N-O-S gas species at the surface are H_2 , H_2O , CH_4 , NH_3 , and H_2S . The resulting atmospheric elemental abundances from these scenarios are shown in Table [1.](#page-10-1) As expected, the atmosphere is highly reduced, with oxygen fugacities varying between IW-8.8 and IW-4.9 (using the oxygen fugacity of the IW buffer by [Hirschmann](#page-19-31) [2021\)](#page-19-31) among the 12 cases with magma. We note that although our calculations of the oxygen fugacities agree to within 0.35 dex with the self-consistent IVTANTHERMO code at $P_s =$ 10^4 bar and $T_s = 3000$ K, as described in Section [2.3,](#page-4-3) the redox state at higher pressures/temperatures is not well understood. Future work is needed to better understand the redox state of gas dwarfs at these conditions.

Overall, we find that H_2O and molecules containing N and S are the most dominant volatile species in the magma ocean, with high surface pressures strongly favouring the solubility of N_2 . As such, for a given interior composition, we find that cooler P-T profiles, resulting in higher P_s , act to increase the depletion of nitrogen in the atmosphere - until the temperature is too low to support a molten surface. The dependence of N depletion on P_s is stronger than that on the melt fraction. Therefore, a hotter temperature profile does not necessarily result in higher N depletion. In terms of the internal structure, we find that the interior needs to be more iron-rich than Earth's interior to result in nitrogen depletion larger than ∼2 dex.

Whilst we find that nitrogen can be depleted under certain conditions, in line with previous works investigating the solubility of nitrogen in reduced interiors [\(Daviau & Lee](#page-19-11) [2021;](#page-19-11) [Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [2022;](#page-19-16) [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [2023;](#page-21-12) [Shorttle et al.](#page-21-10) [2024\)](#page-21-10), we do not reproduce the six orders of magnitude depletion found by S24. Additionally, we also identify sulfur as a potential atmospheric tracer of a magma ocean; however, the depletion is less than that of nitrogen. Finally, we find that the solubility of H_2 , CO, CO₂, and CH₄ is less prominent at the considered conditions and does not drive the abundances of these species far from chemical equilibrium expectations without a magma ocean. However, we note that, as further detailed in Appendix [A,](#page-22-0) many molecular species lack solubility data at the extreme conditions considered here. Hence, further work is needed to improve our knowledge of the solubility of prominent volatiles in silicate melts.

In Figure [6,](#page-13-0) we show the mixing ratios of the major C-H-O-N-S species in the lower atmosphere and the corresponding elemental abundances for a range of oxygen fugacities using the C3 profile and a Mercury-like interior $(f_{silicate} = 30\%)$. This represents the case with the strongest nitrogen depletion, excluding the extreme 5% silicate interior cases, with atmospheric N/H being \sim 2.5 dex lower than the assumed metallicity of $50 \times \text{solar}$. We also see the onset of sulfur depletion in the atmosphere due to the solubility of S_2 at very reducing conditions (∼IW-6 in this case). On the other hand, the carbon abundance remains unchanged, as mentioned above. We also highlight the potential effect of partial melt by doubling the melt mass fraction, shown by the dotted line in Figure [6,](#page-13-0) leading to an approximately linear increase in the depletion of nitrogen.

4.4. Atmospheric Chemistry

We now use the elemental abundances obtained above to determine the atmospheric composition above the surface, using equilibrium and non-equilibrium calculations. From across all the models shown in Table [1,](#page-10-1) we focus on two realistic cases, one with and one without melt. For the molten case, we consider the C3 profile with 30% silicate fraction, which gives a significant N depletion. For the case with no melt we consider the C2 profile with 30% silicate which has no N depletion. For each case, we set the atmospheric elemental budget to that obtained in Section [4.3](#page-12-0) and reported in Table [1.](#page-10-1) As expected from the model set-up, the no-melt scenario results in all elemental abundances being identical to those of a 50×solar metallicity gas.

Across all cases considered, the primary O, C, N, and S reservoirs are H_2O , CH_4 , NH_3 and H_2S over most of the atmosphere, as indicated by the dashed lines in Figure [7.](#page-13-1) This is seen for a pressure range spanning over 10 orders of magnitude and a temperature profile ranging between ∼260-2700 K.

Figure 6. Atmospheric composition at the melt-atmosphere interface as a function of oxygen fugacity, at $T_s = 4200$ K, $P_{\rm s}=2.83\times10^5$ bar, $M_{\rm melt}=0.0578\,M_{\rm p}$, $M_{\rm atm}=0.0383\,M_{\rm p}$ and $50\times$ solar metallicity – corresponding to the C3 profile with a Mercury-like interior composition $(f_{\text{silicate}} = 30\%)$ in Table [1.](#page-10-1) Left: Atmospheric mixing ratios of major H-C-O-N-S species. The solid and dashed lines show the abundances with and without solubility, respectively. Right: Atmospheric elemental abundances normalised to hydrogen. The dotted line corresponds to a case with twice the melt mass fraction to highlight the potential effect of partial melt. The dashed horizontal line shows $50\times \text{solar}$. The grey region centred at IW-7 (± 0.5), shown in both figures, corresponds to the approximate oxygen fugacity obtained with a total oxygen budget of 50×solar.

Figure 7. Vertical mixing ratio profiles for several H-C-O-N-S molecular species. X_i denotes the volume mixing ratio of a species i. Solid and dashed lines denote profiles computed with and without disequilibrium effects. Horizontal data points and arrows denote the mixing ratio constraints and 95% upper estimates retrieved by [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [\(2023b\)](#page-20-2). The gray shaded region denotes the pressure range typically probed by transmission spectroscopy (e.g. [Constantinou & Madhusudhan](#page-19-26) [2024\)](#page-19-26). Left: Mixing ratio profiles corresponding to the C2 P-T profile and 30% interior silicate fraction case shown in Table [1.](#page-10-1) This corresponds to a 50×solar elemental abundances. Right: Profiles computed for the C3 P-T profile and 30% interior silicate fraction case shown in Table [1.](#page-10-1) N is depleted due to dissolution in the magma surface.

Figure 8. Top: Spectral contributions arising from CH₄, NH₃, CO and CO₂ in the transmission spectrum of K2-18 b. The atmospheric abundance of each molecule corresponds to the right-hand side plot of Figure [7,](#page-13-1) generated with the C3 P-T profile, and includes disequilibrium effects. The dashed grey line corresponds to the spectral contribution of NH₃ if it were not depleted by dissolution in the magma. Bottom: The resulting transmission spectrum from all four species' spectral contributions. Blue and orange errorbars are JWST NIRISS and NIRSpec G395H observations of K2-18 b, which include the -41 ppm retrieved offset reported by [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [\(2023b\)](#page-20-2). It can be seen that the magma ocean scenario does not result in sufficient CO² to explain the observations at ∼4.3 µm. We emphasise that the present comparison to the data is solely for illustration. A robust comparison necessitates considering the constraints obtained from a detailed retrieval analysis, as done in Figure [7.](#page-13-1)

The mixing ratio profiles obtained for the no-melt case are shown on the left-hand-side of Figure [7.](#page-13-1) In both the equilibrium and disequilibrium cases, the abundance of $H₂O$ in the upper atmosphere is significantly depleted by a cold trap below the ∼1 bar pressure level. While CO and $CO₂$ are absent from the photosphere in the equilibrium case, they are present in the disequilibrium case, arising from photochemical processes. However, their abundance is significantly hindered by the limited availability of O, with the main carrier H_2O being depleted by the cold trap. The abundance of $CO₂$ is lower than that of CO throughout the atmosphere.

Compared to the retrieved atmospheric composition of K2-18 b [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2), shown as errorbars and arrows in Figure [7,](#page-13-1) the computed CH_4 abundance is consistent with the retrieved constraint. However, there is a substantial difference of ∼8 dex between the computed abundance of $CO₂$ with the measured value across the observable pressure range. Additionally, the retrieved upper limits for H_2O and CO are consistent with the computed amounts. Lastly, the computed value of $NH₃$ is higher than, and therefore inconsistent with the retrieved upper limit.

The right-hand-side of Figure [7](#page-13-1) shows the case with a molten surface. This configuration results in very similar abundances for O- and C-carrying molecules as the no-melt case. This includes the significant depletion of H2O due to a cold trap, the limited production of CO and $CO₂$, and CO being more abundant than $CO₂$. The main difference from the no-melt case is the notable depletion of NH_3 , due to N dissolving in the magma. Specifically NH_3 and N_2 are at much lower mixing ratios than in the no-melt case, by \sim 2 dex. Compared to constraints from observations, CH_4 , H_2O , CO and in this case $NH₃$ as well are consistent with the retrieved constraints and upper limits. However, the resulting $CO₂$ abundance is still substantially lower than the observed abundance.

In summary, we find that even for the case with significant melt, corresponding to our hotter $P-T$ profile with a high T_{int} , the NH₃ abundance is close to the observed 95% upper limit, while the $CO₂$ abundance is still significantly discrepant from the observed value and lower than CO. Therefore, we find that the retrieved atmospheric composition of K2-18 b [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2) is inconsistent with a magma ocean scenario, or more generally with a deep H_2 -rich atmosphere with or without melt, for this planet. In principle, the absence of a cold trap could lead to higher H_2O abundance in the troposphere, which in turn could lead to higher $CO₂$ abundance. However, such a scenario would also give

rise to a significant amount of H_2O and CO, which are presently not detected.

4.5. Sensitivity to Atmospheric Parameters

We also explore other values for the three key atmospheric parameters that may influence the observable composition: the metallicity, the eddy diffusion coefficient K_{zz} , and the internal temperature T_{int} . We consider the two cases shown in Figure [7](#page-13-1) as the canonical cases corresponding to the two P-T profiles (C2 and C3). Both cases assume a median metallicity of 50×solar and K_{zz} of $10^6 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ in the deep atmosphere. It may be argued that a higher metallicity could result in higher $CO₂$ abundances than the canonical cases and better match the observed abundances. Similarly, a broader range of K_{zz} may also influence the abundances. Therefore, for each of the two canonical cases, we investigate models with different values for the metallicity and K_{zz} . We consider metallicities of 100×solar and 300×solar, representing cases with significantly higher metallicities beyond the median retrieved value of \sim 50×solar. For K_{zz} , we explore two end-member scenarios of $10^4 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ and 10^8 cm²s⁻¹. Based on [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-0) [\(2020\)](#page-20-0) and [Valencia et al.](#page-21-1) [\(2013\)](#page-21-1), for our canonical cases we considered values of 25 K and 50 K for T_{int} . We additionally consider the effect of using a P-T profile with a higher T_{int} of 60 K, as has been considered by [Hu](#page-20-29) [\(2021\)](#page-20-29). As found for our canonical cases, we find that the observed CO and $CO₂$ abundances remain unexplained by these models with different values of metallicity, K_{zz} and T_{int} . These results are discussed in full in Appendix [B.](#page-24-0)

4.6. Spectral Characteristics

We use the atmospheric compositions computed in Section [4.4](#page-12-1) to examine the spectral signatures of CH_4 , $NH₃$, CO and CO₂, which have been previously identified as key diagnostics of the presence of a magma surface. Using the VIRA retrieval framework's [\(Con](#page-19-26)[stantinou & Madhusudhan](#page-19-26) [2024\)](#page-19-26) capability of considering non-uniform vertical mixing ratios, we directly use the atmospheric composition profiles computed using the VULCAN [\(Tsai et al.](#page-21-20) [2021\)](#page-21-20) non-equilibrium code described above and shown in Figure [7.](#page-13-1) We specifically consider the melt case discussed above, to evaluate the spectral implications for the presence of a magma layer. For all cases, we consider parametric grey cloud and Rayleigh-like haze properties corresponding to the median retrieved constraints of [Madhusudhan](#page-20-2) [et al.](#page-20-2) [\(2023b\)](#page-20-2), to facilitate a qualitative comparison with the observations. Specifically, we set $log(a) = 10^{7.31}$, $\gamma = -11.67$, $P_c = 10^{-0.55}$ and $\phi_c = 0.63$.

The resulting spectral contributions and transmission spectrum are shown in Figure [8.](#page-14-0) As can be seen in the

top panel, CH⁴ has prominent spectral features throughout the 1-5 μ m wavelength range, while $CO₂$ and CO give rise to absorption features at \sim 4.3 and \sim 4.7 µm respectively. NH₃ shows a spectral feature at \sim 3 µm. Due to the depletion of atmospheric nitrogen arising from its dissolution in the magma, the NH₃ spectral contribution is relatively weak and not detected in the present data. Without such a depletion, i.e. with nitrogen at a solar elemental abundance ratio, $NH₃$ would have prominent spectral features across the wavelength range of comparable strength to $CH₄$. While CO is more abundant than $CO₂$ in the observable atmosphere, as described in Section [4.4,](#page-12-1) the low absolute abundances of both molecules give rise to comparably weak spectral features.

The resulting transmission spectrum provides a reasonable match for the NIRISS observations of K2-18 b at shorter wavelengths due to the strong CH_4 features. However, the spectrum does not fit the prominent $CO₂$ absorption feature seen in the NIRSpec G395H data. Moreover, the spectral contribution of CO is also minimal. Together, the two molecules are present at abundances that do not provide a good fit to the data in the 4-5 μ m range.

Overall, we find that the gas dwarf scenario of a thick H2-rich atmosphere of K2-18 b in equilibrium with a magma ocean at depth is not consistent with the existing JWST observations. In particular, irrespective of the NH_3 depletion, the models predict a low CO_2 abundance and $CO > CO₂$ which are inconsistent with the retrieved abundances. Future studies need to investigate if other effects may contribute to the observed composition. For example, similar to that discussed in [Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [\(2023b\)](#page-20-2), in order for the detected abundance of $CO₂$ to be compatible with a deep H₂-rich atmosphere, an unphysically low C/O ratio of ~ 0.02 – 0.06, together with a moderate C/H ratio (∼30-50× solar) and vertical quenching may be required. However, such an atmosphere could also lead to significant CO abundances that may not be consistent with the observations, and the deep atmosphere would have more H_2O than H_2 .

5. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this study, we report an integrated framework to investigate the plausibility of magma oceans on temperate gas dwarfs, and their potential atmospheric signatures. Our framework models the various components of a planet, and their interplay. Specifically, it includes atmospheric and internal structure modelling, magmaatmosphere chemical interactions, and equilibrium as well as disequilibrium (photochemistry and vertical mixing) processes in the atmosphere. Considering all these

coupled factors, it predicts the observable abundances of molecular species in the atmosphere and the expected spectral features.

We apply our framework to perform a comparative assessment of previous works, validating our modelling of magma-atmosphere interactions against [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12) and assessing the model predictions of [Shorttle](#page-21-10) [et al.](#page-21-10) [\(2024\)](#page-21-10), S24, for a temperate sub-Neptune. Our findings highlight the importance of considering physically plausible models, set up in a holistic framework. In particular, we note that the use of stand-alone magmaatmosphere interaction models, which do not consider the complex interplay of interior and atmospheric factors, can lead to erroneous results.

5.1. Summary

Magma oceans are normally expected for rocky planets with high equilibrium temperatures. In the present work, we have tested the limits of this scenario by exploring whether K2-18 b, a habitable-zone sub-Neptune, can host a magma ocean, as previously suggested by S24, and what the observable signatures could be. We summarise our key findings as follows:

- An integrated framework is essential to obtain physically plausible and self-consistent results for modelling sub-Neptune gas dwarfs. Our framework includes an atmosphere and interior structure model, including phase diagrams and equations of state of appropriate silicates; thermochemical equilibrium calculations for the silicatesatmosphere interface and lower atmosphere; and disequilibrium processes throughout the atmosphere.
- The melt fraction admissible in a gas dwarf depends on atmospheric and interior properties, specifically the interior composition and the atmospheric P-T profile. The P-T profile, in turn, depends strongly on the internal temperature T_{int} , as well as on the presence and properties of clouds/hazes and on the molecular absorbers present in the atmosphere. For a gas dwarf scenario assuming the bulk parameters of K2-18 b, we find that, with an Earth-like interior composition, maximal melt mass fractions of ∼10% are possible, and may increase somewhat if partial melting is considered.
- A planet's bulk parameters and temperature structure place both upper and lower limits on the envelope mass fraction, assuming a gas dwarf scenario. For the K2-18 b models considered in this work,

these limits are \sim 1% and 7% of the planet mass, corresponding to a pure silicate and a 95% iron interior, respectively. The envelope mass fraction affects the surface pressure at the rock-atmosphere boundary, which, in turn, affects the potential melt conditions.

- We find using our framework that the current chemical constraints for K2-18 b are inconsistent with a magma ocean scenario or any gas dwarf scenario, contrary to S24. Firstly, the high observed abundance of $CO₂$ along with low $H₂O$ is inconsistent with the chemical expectations for the gas dwarf scenario. Secondly, we find CO to be higher than $CO₂$ by over 1 dex which is also inconsistent with the observations. We find this to be the case with or without a magma ocean, and relatively independent of the uncertainties in magmaatmosphere interactions at the extremely reduced conditions as described in Appendix [A.](#page-22-0) Finally, we find that N depletion in the atmosphere depends on a wide range of atmospheric and interior parameters, and can range between no depletion and \sim 2.5 dex for a realistic model space, given available solubility data.
- Overall, we find that key atmospheric signatures for identifying a gas dwarf include the CO and $CO₂$ abundances, and, if melt is present, possible nitrogen depletion, consistent with some previous studies (cf. Section [3\)](#page-6-0). In particular, we expect that $CO/CO₂$ 1 if no $H₂O$ is observed (as a result, e.g., of condensation), or, in the presence of H_2O , $CO/CO₂ \leq 1$, due to photolysis of H₂O making more oxygen available for the formation of $CO₂$. Furthermore, we find that N depletion is more sensitive to the surface pressure than to the amount of melt present, provided this is non-zero. Thus, the presence of a magma ocean does not ensure a significant N depletion in the atmosphere.
- Our models predict significant H_2S for a deep H_2 rich atmosphere scenario. Hence, a lack of H_2S may be indicative of a shallow atmosphere. However, we note that there are significant uncertainties in the behaviour of S-bearing species in silicate melts at such extremely reducing conditions. Therefore, more robust data for such conditions is needed in order for this signature to be used with a higher degree of confidence. We also note that there is uncertainty in the sulfur photochemical network for such planetary conditions.

• As discussed below, a number of important unknowns remain. In particular, as discussed in Ap-pendix [A,](#page-22-0) the solubility of NH_3 in magma remains poorly understood, especially at extremely reducing conditions, as is also the case for H_2S at high pressures and temperatures.

5.2. Future Work

In order to aid accurate modelling of potential gas dwarf magma ocean planets, further developments are needed in three areas: (1) solubility laws for volatiles at extremely high pressures and temperatures and very reducing conditions, (2) equations of state (EOS) of silicates at the conditions relevant to temperate sub-Neptunes, and (3) complete reactions lists for all relevant atmospheric species.

As discussed in Appendix [A,](#page-22-0) there is a pressing need for further experimental data and/or ab initio simulations on the solubility of volatile species in silicate melt at the physical and chemical conditions that we have shown in this study to be relevant to the magmaatmosphere interface on sub-Neptunes. This includes high pressure and temperature, and low oxygen fugacity. In particular, the availability of $NH₃$ solubility laws at these conditions would allow more precise prescriptions than assuming its solubility to be negligible, avoiding the resulting likely overestimation of the abundance of N-bearing species in the atmosphere. In general, present laws are expected to give an order-of-magnitude estimate of the solubility at the conditions explored in this study; future work is needed to improve the solubility data.

Furthermore, once more accurate and precise solubility laws become available, the non-ideality of gas behaviour at the high pressures relevant at the interface may become a notable source of error if ignored, and will thus need to be appropriately treated [\(Kite et al.](#page-20-9) [2019;](#page-20-9) [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [2022\)](#page-21-6). We also note that, as a result of the lack of knowledge on the solubility of volatiles in the melt, the phase of the melt itself is not well-constrained. In particular, it is possible that some of the models considered here fall in a regime where there is no surface, and the atmosphere and magma become a single continuous phase at some lower pressure. This would happen if the volatiles were completely miscible in the melt, as is the case for water above a few GPa [\(Ni et al.](#page-20-31) [2017\)](#page-20-31). It is however not known whether this behaviour applies to H_2 -dominated atmospheres such as the one considered here. Furthermore, even if complete miscibility is not achieved, it is possible that the presence of volatiles in the magma may lead to a change in its EOS, which has not been accounted for here, where

we have instead assumed a volatile-free melt for the internal structure calculations.

There is also scope for future work on the internal structure modelling, including the melt. This includes implementing the partial melting that would occur due to the magma's heterogeneous nature between the solidus and liquidus, as shown in Figures [3](#page-5-0) and [5.](#page-11-0) This is expected to result in a larger fraction of the mantle being at least partially melted than when considering the fully melted region alone, hence further depleting the atmosphere of the most soluble species. This effect is however in part addressed in this work, by considering the impact of a doubled melt mass fraction, as shown in Figure [6.](#page-13-0) Furthermore, future work will include more detailed prescriptions for the mantle, including alternate mineral compositions, and a fully temperaturedependent EOS for the solid portion.

Overall, JWST provides a promising avenue for atmospheric characterisation of sub-Neptune exoplanets. The high quality of the observations means that concomitant advances need to be made in theoretical models to maximise the scientific return from the data. In this work, we have outlined an end-to-end framework for gas dwarf sub-Neptunes to enable an evaluation of this scenario given high precision JWST data, and highlight the need for more accurate inputs for these models. Such advancements in both observations and theory promise

a new era in the characterisation of low-mass exoplanets with JWST.

Acknowledgements: We thank the reviewer for their helpful comments on the manuscript. N.M., L.P.C. and F.R. acknowledge support from the Science & Technologies Facilities Council (STFC) towards the PhD studies of L.P.C. and F.R. (UKRI grants 2886925 and 2605554). N.M. and M.H. acknowledge support from STFC Center for Doctoral Training (CDT) in Data Intensive Science at the University of Cambridge (grant No. ST/P006787/1), and the MERAC Foundation, Switzerland, towards the doctoral studies of M.H. N.M. and S.C. acknowledge support from the UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) Frontier Grant (EP/X025179/1, PI: N. Madhusudhan). J.D. acknowledges support from Grant EAR- 2242946 of National Science Foundation. K.K.M.L acknowledges support from the US Coast Guard Academy Faculty Research Fellowship. J.M. acknowledges NASA grant 80NSSC23K0281. This work was performed using resources provided by the Cambridge Service for Data Driven Discovery (CSD3) operated by the University of Cambridge Research Computing Service [\(www.csd3.cam.ac.uk\)](www.csd3.cam.ac.uk), provided by Dell EMC and Intel using Tier-2 funding from STFC (capital grant EP/P020259/1), and DiRAC funding from STFC [\(www.dirac.ac.uk\)](www.dirac.ac.uk).

REFERENCES

- Abel, M., Frommhold, L., Li, X., & Hunt, K. L. C. 2011, Journal of Physical Chemistry A, 115, 6805, doi: [10.1021/jp109441f](http://doi.org/10.1021/jp109441f)
- Ardia, P., Hirschmann, M. M., Withers, A. C., & Stanley, B. D. 2013, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 114, 52, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2013.03.028](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2013.03.028)
- Armstrong, L. S., Hirschmann, M. M., Stanley, B. D., Falksen, E. G., & Jacobsen, S. D. 2015, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 171, 283, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2015.07.007](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2015.07.007)
- Asplund, M., Amarsi, A. M., & Grevesse, N. 2021, A&A, 653, A141, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202140445](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202140445)
- Asplund, M., Grevesse, N., Sauval, A. J., & Scott, P. 2009, Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics, 47, 481, doi: [10.1146/annurev.astro.46.060407.145222](http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.astro.46.060407.145222)
- Azzam, A. A. A., Tennyson, J., Yurchenko, S. N., & Naumenko, O. V. 2016, MNRAS, 460, 4063, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw1133](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw1133)
- Barber, R. J., Strange, J. K., Hill, C., et al. 2014, MNRAS, 437, 1828, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stt2011](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt2011)
- Barber, R. J., Tennyson, J., Harris, G. J., & Tolchenov, R. N. 2006, MNRAS, 368, 1087, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2006.10184.x](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2006.10184.x)
- Bean, J. L., Raymond, S. N., & Owen, J. E. 2021, Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 126, e2020JE006639, doi: [10.1029/2020JE006639](http://doi.org/10.1029/2020JE006639)
- Belov, G. V., Iorish, V. S., & Yungman, V. S. 1999, Calphad, 23, 173,
	- doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-5916\(99\)00023-1](http://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0364-5916(99)00023-1)
- Benneke, B., Wong, I., Piaulet, C., et al. 2019, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 887, L14, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab59dc](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab59dc)
- Benneke, B., Roy, P.-A., Coulombe, L.-P., et al. 2024, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2403.03325, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2403.03325](http://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.03325)
- Bernadou, F., Gaillard, F., Füri, E., Marrocchi, Y., & Slodczyk, A. 2021, Chemical Geology, 573, 120192, doi: [10.1016/j.chemgeo.2021.120192](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2021.120192)
- Borysow, J., Frommhold, L., & Birnbaum, G. 1988, ApJ, 326, 509, doi: [10.1086/166112](http://doi.org/10.1086/166112)
- Boulliung, J., Füri, E., Dalou, C., et al. 2020, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 284, 120, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2020.06.020](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2020.06.020)
- Boulliung, J., & Wood, B. J. 2023, Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology, 178, 56, doi: [10.1007/s00410-023-02033-9](http://doi.org/10.1007/s00410-023-02033-9)
- Bower, D. J., Hakim, K., Sossi, P. A., & Sanan, P. 2022, The Planetary Science Journal, 3, 93, doi: [10.3847/PSJ/ac5fb1](http://doi.org/10.3847/PSJ/ac5fb1)
- Castor, J. I., Dykema, P. G., & Klein, R. I. 1992, ApJ. . ., 387
- Chabrier, G., Mazevet, S., & Soubiran, F. 2019, ApJ, 872, 51, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaf99f](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaf99f)
- Charnoz, S., Falco, A., Tremblin, P., et al. 2023, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 674, A224, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202245763](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202245763)
- Chase, M. 1998, NIST-JANAF Thermochemical Tables, 4th Edition (American Institute of Physics, -1)
- Chubb, K. L., Tennyson, J., & Yurchenko, S. N. 2020, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 493, 1531, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa229](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa229)
- Chubb, K. L., Naumenko, O., Keely, S., et al. 2018, JQSRT, 218, 178, doi: [10.1016/j.jqsrt.2018.07.012](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2018.07.012)
- Clemente, B., Scaillet, B., & Pichavant, M. 2004, Journal of Petrology, 45, 2171, doi: [10.1093/petrology/egh052](http://doi.org/10.1093/petrology/egh052)
- Cloutier, R., & Menou, K. 2020, AJ, 159, 211, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/ab8237](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/ab8237)
- Cloutier, R., Astudillo-Defru, N., Doyon, R., et al. 2019, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 621, A49, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201833995](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833995)
- Constantinou, S., & Madhusudhan, N. 2024, MNRAS, 530, 3252, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stae633](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stae633)
- Damiano, M., Bello-Arufe, A., Yang, J., & Hu, R. 2024, ApJL, 968, L22, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ad5204](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ad5204)
- Dasgupta, R., Falksen, E., Pal, A., & Sun, C. 2022, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 336, 291, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2022.09.012](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2022.09.012)
- Daviau, K., & Lee, K. K. M. 2021, Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 126, e2020JE006687, doi: [10.1029/2020JE006687](http://doi.org/10.1029/2020JE006687)
- Dixon, J. E., Stolper, E. M., & Holloway, J. R. 1995, Journal of Petrology, 36, 1607, doi: [10.1093/oxfordjournals.petrology.a037267](http://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.petrology.a037267)
- Dorn, C., Venturini, J., Khan, A., et al. 2017, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 597, A37, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201628708](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201628708)
- Doyon, R. 2024, Do Temperate Rocky Planets Around M Dwarfs have an Atmosphere ?, arXiv, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2403.12617](http://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.12617)
- Elkins-Tanton, L. T. 2008, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 271, 181, doi: [10.1016/j.epsl.2008.03.062](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2008.03.062)
- Falco, A., Tremblin, P., Charnoz, S., Ridgway, J. R., & Lagage, P.-O. 2024, Astronomy & Astrophysics, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202347650](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202347650)
- Fiquet, G., Auzende, A. L., Siebert, J., et al. 2010, Science, 329, 1516, doi: [10.1126/science.1192448](http://doi.org/10.1126/science.1192448)
- Fortney, J. J., Mordasini, C., Nettelmann, N., et al. 2013, ApJ, 775, 80, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/775/1/80](http://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/775/1/80)
- Fressin, F., Torres, G., Charbonneau, D., et al. 2013, ApJ, 766, 81, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/766/2/81](http://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/766/2/81)
- Fulton, B. J., & Petigura, E. A. 2018, AJ, 156, 264, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aae828](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aae828)
- Fulton, B. J., Petigura, E. A., Howard, A. W., et al. 2017, The Astronomical Journal, 154, 109, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa80eb](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa80eb)
- Gaillard, F., Bernadou, F., Roskosz, M., et al. 2022, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 577, 117255, doi: [10.1016/j.epsl.2021.117255](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2021.117255)
- Gandhi, S., & Madhusudhan, N. 2017, MNRAS, 472, 2334, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx1601](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx1601)
- Gao, Z., Yang, Y.-N., Yang, S.-Y., & Li, Y. 2022, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 326, 17, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2022.04.001](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2022.04.001)
- Ginzburg, S., Schlichting, H. E., & Sari, R. 2016, The Astrophysical Journal, 825, 29, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/825/1/29](http://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/825/1/29)
- —. 2018, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 476, 759, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty290](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty290)
- Glein, C. R. 2024, ApJL, 964, L19, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ad3079](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ad3079)
- Guillot, B., & Sator, N. 2011, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 75, 1829, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2011.01.004](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2011.01.004)
- Gupta, A., & Schlichting, H. E. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 487, 24, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz1230](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz1230)
- —. 2020, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 493, 792, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa315](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa315)
- Gurvich, L. V., & Veyts, I. 1990, Thermodynamic properties of individual substances: elements and compounds, Vol. 2 (CRC press)
- Hamano, K., Abe, Y., & Genda, H. 2013, Nature, 497, 607, doi: [10.1038/nature12163](http://doi.org/10.1038/nature12163)
- Hirschmann, M. 2021, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 313, 74, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2021.08.039](http://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2021.08.039)
- Hirschmann, M., Withers, A., Ardia, P., & Foley, N. 2012, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 345-348, 38, doi: [10.1016/j.epsl.2012.06.031](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2012.06.031)
- Hirschmann, M. M. 2016, American Mineralogist, 101, 540, doi: [10.2138/am-2016-5452](http://doi.org/10.2138/am-2016-5452)
- Holmberg, M., & Madhusudhan, N. 2024, A&A, 683, L2, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202348238](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202348238)
- Hu, R. 2021, ApJ, 921, 27, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac1789](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac1789)

Hu, R., Damiano, M., Scheucher, M., et al. 2021, ApJL, 921, L8, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ac1f92](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac1f92)

Hubeny, I. 2017, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 469, 841, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx758](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx758)

Iacono-Marziano, G., Morizet, Y., Le Trong, E., & Gaillard, F. 2012, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 97, 1, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2012.08.035](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2012.08.035)

Izidoro, A., Bitsch, B., Raymond, S. N., et al. 2021, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 650, A152, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201935336](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201935336)

Jin, S., & Mordasini, C. 2018, The Astrophysical Journal, 853, 163, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa9f1e](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa9f1e)

Jin, S., Mordasini, C., Parmentier, V., et al. 2014, The Astrophysical Journal, 795, 65, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/795/1/65](http://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/795/1/65)

Kite, E. S., Bruce Fegley Jr., Schaefer, L., & Gaidos, E. 2016, The Astrophysical Journal, 828, 80, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/828/2/80](http://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/828/2/80)

Kite, E. S., Jr, B. F., Schaefer, L., & Ford, E. B. 2019, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 887, L33, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab59d9](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab59d9)

—. 2020, The Astrophysical Journal, 891, 111, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab6ffb](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab6ffb)

Kite, E. S., & Schaefer, L. 2021, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 909, L22, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/abe7dc](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/abe7dc)

Lebrun, T., Massol, H., ChassefièRe, E., et al. 2013, Journal of Geophysical Research (Planets), 118, 1155, doi: [10.1002/jgre.20068](http://doi.org/10.1002/jgre.20068)

Leconte, J., Spiga, A., Clément, N., et al. 2024, A&A, 686, A131, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202348928](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202348928)

Lee, K. K. M., O'Neill, B., Panero, W. R., et al. 2004, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 223, 381, doi: [10.1016/j.epsl.2004.04.033](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2004.04.033)

Lesne, P., Scaillet, B., & Pichavant, M. 2015, Chemical Geology, 418, 104, doi: [10.1016/j.chemgeo.2015.03.025](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2015.03.025)

Li, G., Gordon, I. E., Rothman, L. S., et al. 2015, ApJS, 216, 15, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/216/1/15](http://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/216/1/15)

Libourel, G., Marty, B., & Humbert, F. 2003, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 67, 4123, doi: [10.1016/S0016-7037\(03\)00259-X](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7037(03)00259-X)

Lichtenberg, T., Bower, D. J., Hammond, M., et al. 2021, Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets, 126, e2020JE006711, doi: [10.1029/2020JE006711](http://doi.org/10.1029/2020JE006711)

Lopez, E. D., & Fortney, J. J. 2013, The Astrophysical Journal, 776, 2, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/776/1/2](http://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/776/1/2)

Madhusudhan, N. 2018, in Handbook of Exoplanets, ed. H. J. Deeg & J. A. Belmonte (Springer Cham), 104, doi: [10.1007/978-3-319-55333-7](http://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-55333-7_104) 104

Madhusudhan, N., Moses, J. I., Rigby, F., & Barrier, E. 2023a, Faraday Discussions, doi: [10.1039/d3fd00075c](http://doi.org/10.1039/d3fd00075c)

Madhusudhan, N., Nixon, M. C., Welbanks, L., Piette, A. A. A., & Booth, R. A. 2020, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 891, L7, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab7229](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab7229)

Madhusudhan, N., Piette, A. A. A., & Constantinou, S. 2021, The Astrophysical Journal, 918, 1, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/abfd9c](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/abfd9c)

Madhusudhan, N., Sarkar, S., Constantinou, S., et al. 2023b, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 956, L13, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/acf577](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/acf577)

Mallik, A., Li, Y., & Wiedenbeck, M. 2018, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 482, 556, doi: [10.1016/j.epsl.2017.11.045](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2017.11.045)

Matsui, T., & Abe, Y. 1986, Nature, 319, 303, doi: [10.1038/319303a0](http://doi.org/10.1038/319303a0)

Misener, W., Schlichting, H. E., & Young, E. D. 2023, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 524, 981, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stad1910](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad1910)

- Miyazaki, A., Hiyagon, H., Sugiura, N., Hirose, K., & Takahashi, E. 2004, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 68, 387, doi: [10.1016/S0016-7037\(03\)00484-8](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7037(03)00484-8)
- Monteux, J., Andrault, D., & Samuel, H. 2016, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 448, 140, doi: [10.1016/j.epsl.2016.05.010](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2016.05.010)
- Moore, G., Vennemann, T., & Carmichael, I. S. E. 1995, Geology, 23, 1099, doi: [10.1130/0091-7613\(1995\)023](http://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(1995)023<1099:SOWIMT>2.3.CO;2)⟨1099: [SOWIMT](http://doi.org/10.1130/0091-7613(1995)023<1099:SOWIMT>2.3.CO;2)⟩2.3.CO;2

Ni, H., Zhang, L., Xiong, X., Mao, Z., & Wang, J. 2017, Earth-Science Reviews, 167, 62, doi: [10.1016/j.earscirev.2017.02.006](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2017.02.006)

Nixon, M. C., & Madhusudhan, N. 2021, MNRAS, 505, 3414, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab1500](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab1500)

O'Neill, H., & Mavrogenes, J. 2002, Journal of Petrology, 43, 1049

- Orton, G. S., Gustafsson, M., Burgdorf, M., & Meadows, V. 2007, Icarus, 189, 544, doi: [10.1016/j.icarus.2007.02.003](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.icarus.2007.02.003)
- Owen, J. E., & Wu, Y. 2017, The Astrophysical Journal, 847, 29, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa890a](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa890a)

Pan, V., Holloway, J. R., & Hervig, R. L. 1991, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 55, 1587, doi: [10.1016/0016-7037\(91\)90130-W](http://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(91)90130-W)

Papale, P., Moretti, R., & Barbato, D. 2006, Chemical Geology, 229, 78, doi: [10.1016/j.chemgeo.2006.01.013](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2006.01.013)

Peacock, S., Barman, T., Shkolnik, E. L., et al. 2020, ApJ, 895, 5, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ab893a](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab893a)

- Piette, A. A. A., & Madhusudhan, N. 2020, The Astrophysical Journal, 904, 154, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/abbfb1](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/abbfb1)
- Richard, C., Gordon, I., Rothman, L., et al. 2012, JQSRT, 113, 1276 ,

doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2011.11.004](http://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2011.11.004)

Rigby, F. E., & Madhusudhan, N. 2024, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 529, 409, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stae413](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stae413)

Rogers, J. G., Gupta, A., Owen, J. E., & Schlichting, H. E. 2021, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 508, 5886, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab2897](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab2897)

Rogers, L. A., Bodenheimer, P., Lissauer, J. J., & Seager, S. 2011, ApJ, 738, 59, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/738/1/59](http://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/738/1/59)

Roskosz, M., Bouhifd, M., Jephcoat, A., Marty, B., & Mysen, B. 2013, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 121, 15, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2013.07.007](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2013.07.007)

Rothman, L., Gordon, I., Barber, R., et al. 2010, JQSRT, 111, 2139 ,

doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2010.05.001](http://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2010.05.001)

Schaefer, L., & Fegley, B. 2017, The Astrophysical Journal, 843, 120, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa784f](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa784f)

Schaefer, L., Wordsworth, R. D., Berta-Thompson, Z., & Sasselov, D. 2016, The Astrophysical Journal, 829, 63, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/829/2/63](http://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/829/2/63)

Schlichting, H. E., & Young, E. D. 2022, The Planetary Science Journal, 3, 127, doi: [10.3847/PSJ/ac68e6](http://doi.org/10.3847/PSJ/ac68e6)

Seager, S., Kuchner, M., Hier-Majumder, C. A., & Militzer, B. 2007, ApJ, 669, 1279, doi: [10.1086/521346](http://doi.org/10.1086/521346)

Shorttle, O., Jordan, S., Nicholls, H., Lichtenberg, T., & Bower, D. J. 2024, ApJL, 962, L8, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ad206e](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ad206e)

Silver, L. A., Ihinger, P. D., & Stolper, E. 1990, Contributions to Mineralogy and Petrology, 104, 142, doi: [10.1007/BF00306439](http://doi.org/10.1007/BF00306439)

Sossi, P. A., Tollan, P. M. E., Badro, J., & Bower, D. J. 2023, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 601, 117894, doi: [10.1016/j.epsl.2022.117894](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2022.117894)

Stock, J. W., Kitzmann, D., & Patzer, A. B. C. 2022, MNRAS, 517, 4070, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac2623](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac2623)

Stock, J. W., Kitzmann, D., Patzer, A. B. C., & Sedlmayr, E. 2018, MNRAS, 479, 865, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty1531](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1531)

Stolper, E. 1982, GeoCoA, 46, 2609, doi: [10.1016/0016-7037\(82\)90381-7](http://doi.org/10.1016/0016-7037(82)90381-7)

Suer, T.-A., Jackson, C., Grewal, D. S., Dalou, C., & Lichtenberg, T. 2023, Frontiers in Earth Science, 11, 1159412, doi: [10.3389/feart.2023.1159412](http://doi.org/10.3389/feart.2023.1159412)

- Tashkun, S. A., Perevalov, V. I., Gamache, R. R., & Lamouroux, J. 2015, JQSRT, 152, 45, doi: [10.1016/j.jqsrt.2014.10.017](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jqsrt.2014.10.017)
- Thomas, C. W., & Asimow, P. D. 2013, Journal of Geophysical Research (Solid Earth), 118, 5738, doi: [10.1002/jgrb.50374](http://doi.org/10.1002/jgrb.50374)

Tian, M., & Heng, K. 2024, ApJ, 963, 157, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad217c](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad217c)

- Tsai, S.-M., Innes, H., Lichtenberg, T., et al. 2021, ApJL, 922, L27, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ac399a](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac399a)
- Underwood, D. S., Tennyson, J., Yurchenko, S. N., et al. 2016, MNRAS, 459, 3890, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw849](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw849)
- Valencia, D., Guillot, T., Parmentier, V., & Freedman, R. S. 2013, ApJ, 775, 10, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/775/1/10](http://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/775/1/10)
- Venturini, J., Guilera, O. M., Haldemann, J., Ronco, M. P., & Mordasini, C. 2020, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 643, L1, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202039141](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202039141)
- Venturini, J., Ronco, M. P., Guilera, O. M., et al. 2024, A&A, 686, L9, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202349088](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202349088)
- Wogan, N. F., Batalha, N. E., Zahnle, K. J., et al. 2024, ApJL, 963, L7, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ad2616](http://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ad2616)
- Woitke, P., Helling, C., Hunter, G. H., et al. 2018, A&A, 614, A1, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201732193](http://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201732193)

Woodland, A. B., Girnis, A. V., Bulatov, V. K., Brey, G. P., & Höfer, H. E. 2019, Chemical Geology, 505, 12, doi: [10.1016/j.chemgeo.2018.12.008](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.chemgeo.2018.12.008)

Wordsworth, R. D. 2016, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 447, 103, doi: [10.1016/j.epsl.2016.04.002](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsl.2016.04.002)

- Yoshioka, T., Nakashima, D., Nakamura, T., Shcheka, S., & Keppler, H. 2019, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 259, 129, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2019.06.007](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2019.06.007)
- Yu, X., Moses, J. I., Fortney, J. J., & Zhang, X. 2021, ApJ, 914, 38, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/abfdc7](http://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/abfdc7)

Yurchenko, S. N., Barber, R. J., & Tennyson, J. 2011, MNRAS, 413, 1828,

doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.18261.x](http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.18261.x)

- Yurchenko, S. N., & Tennyson, J. 2014, MNRAS, 440, 1649, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu326](http://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu326)
- Zajacz, Z., Candela, P. A., Piccoli, P. M., Sanchez-Valle, C., & Wälle, M. 2013, Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 112, 288, doi: [10.1016/j.gca.2013.02.026](http://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2013.02.026)
- Zeng, L., Jacobsen, S. B., Sasselov, D. D., et al. 2019, Proceedings of the National Academy of Science, 116, 9723, doi: [10.1073/pnas.1812905116](http://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1812905116)

APPENDIX

A. AVAILABILITY OF SOLUBILITY LAWS

We discuss here the availability of silicate melt solubility laws for the volatile species of interest, at the chemical and physical conditions relevant for magma oceans on temperate sub-Neptunes in the gas dwarf scenario. These findings motivate our choices for the solubility laws adopted in this work. We compile a bibliography of the solubility laws consulted for the preparation of this work in Table [2,](#page-26-0) and show a selection of them in Figure [9.](#page-25-0) For most compositiondependent laws, we adopt a basalt composition for the melt – specifically, when a law explicitly depends on melt composition parameters, we set these to the values corresponding to the Mt Etna basalt from [Iacono-Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [\(2012\)](#page-20-17). This choice is due to the wide availability of solubility laws for basaltic melt and because of the association of basalt with peridotite, which we assume to be the mantle composition.

A.1. Nitrogen Species

The solubility of N_2 has been explored for a wide range of parameters (e.g., [Libourel et al.](#page-20-27) [2003;](#page-20-27) [Miyazaki et al.](#page-20-32) [2004;](#page-20-32) [Roskosz et al.](#page-21-30) [2013;](#page-21-30) [Mallik et al.](#page-20-33) [2018;](#page-20-33) [Boulliung et al.](#page-19-34) [2020;](#page-19-34) [Bernadou et al.](#page-18-12) [2021;](#page-18-12) [Gao et al.](#page-19-35) [2022\)](#page-19-35), at pressures up to 14.8 GPa and temperatures up to 2800 K [\(Roskosz et al.](#page-21-30) [2013\)](#page-21-30). By compiling the available data at $P \leq 8.2$ GPa and adding their own measurements, [Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [\(2022\)](#page-19-16) proposed the solubility law which we use in our calculations. This law, however, does not appear to extrapolate well at higher pressures and moderately reduced conditions $(f_{O_2} \sim \text{IW} - 2)$. As warned by [Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [\(2022\)](#page-19-16), experimental data indicate the solubility seems to reach a plateau, while the law predicts solubility to monotonically increase with pressure. A direct comparison with [Roskosz et al.](#page-21-30) [\(2013\)](#page-21-30)'s 10 GPa and 14.8 GPa data points reveals indeed a true solubility ∼ 1 order of magnitude lower than predicted using [Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [\(2022\)](#page-19-16)'s law for pure nitrogen vapor. At the extremely reduced conditions explored here, the plateau effect is expected to already be significant at lower pressures [\(Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [2022\)](#page-19-16).

It is also noteworthy that [Gao et al.](#page-19-35) [\(2022\)](#page-19-35) - whose data was included in the [Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [\(2022\)](#page-19-16) dataset find some indication of a decrease in the *physical* solubility of N_2 already at $P = 8$ GPa. We note that physical solubility is expected to be the dominant solubility mechanism at the oxidized conditions explored by [Gao et al.](#page-19-35) [2022,](#page-19-35) as opposed to the chemical solubility relevant at reduced conditions [\(Libourel et al.](#page-20-27) [2003\)](#page-20-27). Nevertheless, as the relevant quantity is not the total pressure, but rather the nitrogen partial pressure, we believe that the [Dasgupta et al.](#page-19-16) [\(2022\)](#page-19-16) law can still be a reasonably good approximation even at the reducing, high-pressure conditions that apply at the magma-atmosphere interface, given that the expected N_2 mixing ratio in the atmosphere is $\lesssim 10^{-4}$ in the present models.

The lack of data or simulations for the solubility of NH_3 in silicate melt leads us to neglect it, with the caveat that this will lead to our calculations setting only an upper limit on the abundance of N-bearing species in the atmosphere.

A.2. Carbon Species

Of the three prominent carbon species (CO_2, CO, CH_4) , CO_2 is by far the one for which the most complete experimental data on solubility in magma is available (e.g., [Pan et al.](#page-20-34) [1991;](#page-20-34) [Dixon et al.](#page-19-36) [1995;](#page-19-36) [Papale et al.](#page-20-35) [2006;](#page-20-35) [Iacono-Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [2012\)](#page-20-17). Considering this wide dataset, for the case of $T = 2273$ K and a bulk silicate Earth (BSE) melt composition, [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12) find that the solubility of CO_2 is well-approximated by Henry's Law, which they fit to the data. [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12)'s law is in excellent agreement with high pressure ($P \geq 8$ GPa) molecular dynamics simulations by [Guillot & Sator](#page-19-37) [\(2011\)](#page-19-37) for the $T = 2273$ K and rhyolite case, and in good agreement with the corresponding mid-ocean ridge basalt (MORB) case. Interestingly, the agreement is slightly worse with the kimberlite melt case, where instead the melt is closest to Suer's BSE composition.

At lower pressures, the agreement with the simulations is worse, but still within a factor of order unity. In any case, the agreement between [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12)'s law and [Guillot & Sator](#page-19-37) [\(2011\)](#page-19-37)'s simulations is always satisfactory, which also highlights the weak dependence of the solubility of $CO₂$ on the melt composition, particularly at $P \leq 8$ GPa [\(Guillot & Sator](#page-19-37) [2011\)](#page-19-37). Despite the fact that the [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12) law is intended for lower temperatures than those relevant in this study, due to the lack of more appropriate alternatives we adopt it in our calculations.

For CO, there is a lack of solubility data at high pressure and temperature. Solubility laws are provided by, e.g., [Armstrong et al.](#page-18-13) [\(2015\)](#page-18-13) and [Yoshioka et al.](#page-21-16) [\(2019\)](#page-21-16) (for both MORB and rhyolite melts), both of whom carried out experiments at $P \sim 1$ GPa and $T \sim 1500^{\circ}$ C. The lack of data may be explained by the fact that exploring the solubility of CO at high pressures is especially complicated, because the $2CO = C + CO₂$ reaction gets skewed to the right as pressure grows, making an initially pure CO vapour spontaneously become mostly CO_2 at $P \gtrsim 1$ GPa [\(Yoshioka et al.](#page-21-16) [2019\)](#page-21-16).

An alternative prescription, used by [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [\(2022\)](#page-21-6) as informed by [Hirschmann](#page-19-38) [\(2016\)](#page-19-38), is to instead set the solubility of CO to be one third of that of CO_2 . This method, taking [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12)'s BSE law for the $CO₂$ solubility, yields a CO solubility significantly higher than any of the other laws mentioned so far. This might be due to [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12)'s law being tested for different temperatures and melt compositions. This, however, seems unlikely: on the one hand, the solubility of CO is only weakly dependent on temperature [\(Yoshioka et al.](#page-21-16) [2019\)](#page-21-16); on the other hand, [Yoshioka et al.](#page-21-16) [\(2019\)](#page-21-16)'s two laws for MORB and rhyolite yield results less than an order of magnitude apart. This indicates a comparatively weak dependence of solubility on melt composition, while [Schlichting & Young](#page-21-6) [\(2022\)](#page-21-6)'s prescription applied to [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12)'s law results in a solubility between 1 and 2 orders of magnitude higher, depending on the pressure. Ultimately, we use the [Yoshioka et al.](#page-21-16) [\(2019\)](#page-21-16) MORB law in our calculations, due to it being more recent and calibrated at higher pressures than [Armstrong et al.](#page-18-13) [\(2015\)](#page-18-13).

The data on CH_4 seems to be even sparser: the only solubility law we encountered in the literature – which we use here – is the one in [Ardia et al.](#page-18-2) [\(2013\)](#page-18-2), resulting from experiments at $0.7 \leq P \leq 3$ GPa and $1400 \leq T \leq 1450$ °C, and the Henry's Law fit to their data by [Lichtenberg et al.](#page-20-26) [\(2021\)](#page-20-26) - the law by [Ardia et al.](#page-18-2) [\(2013\)](#page-18-2), indeed, follows Henry's law for total pressures $P \lesssim 10^4$ bar (at $T = 3000$ K, regardless of the CH₄ partial pressure).

A.3. Other Volatiles

The other major volatiles of note are expected to be sulfur species, water, and H_2 , as well as He, which, however, as a noble gas, has no impact on the atmospheric chemistry.

Chemical equilibrium calculations indicate that, at conditions relevant at the interface, sulfur will be mostly in H_2S , with little S_2 . For S_2 we use the law by [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12). It should be noted that this law is calibrated only with data collected at atmospheric pressure, relatively low temperature ($T \leq 1673$ K), and not very reducing conditions $(\Delta I W \ge -1)$. As such, its extrapolation to the extreme conditions explored in this paper should be considered only as a zeroth-order estimate of the true solubility. No significant high-pressure/high-temperature data to compare with [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12)'s predictions were found either, the [Woodland et al.](#page-21-31) [\(2019\)](#page-21-31) high-pressure data being for a carbonate-silicate melt.

For H₂S, we found two laws in the literature, by [Clemente et al.](#page-19-22) (2004) – for rhyolite – and by [Lesne et al.](#page-20-36) (2015) – for basaltic melts. The former is calibrated for $1073 \leq T \leq 1273$ K and $P = 2 \times 10^3$ bar, while the latter for $1323 \leq T \leq 1473$ K and $250 \leq P \leq 2 \times 10^3$ bar. The two laws differ significantly in their temperature dependence: [Clemente et al.](#page-19-22) (2004) find that the solubility of H_2S moderately increases with increasing temperature, while the law by [Lesne et al.](#page-20-36) [\(2015\)](#page-20-36) indicates an extremely strong and negative temperature dependence. Furthermore, [Lesne et al.](#page-20-36) [\(2015\)](#page-20-36) include a dependence on the mole fraction of FeO in the magma, while the law by [Clemente et al.](#page-19-22) [\(2004\)](#page-19-22) only depends on thermodynamic parameters. However, when extrapolated to high temperature ($T \sim 3000 \text{ K}$) and pressure $(P \sim 10^5$ bar), both laws predict negligibly small solubility for H₂S at the expected mixing ratios (shown in Figure [6\)](#page-13-0). Hence, we do not expect the results of our investigation to be noticeably impacted by the choice of one law over the other. In this investigation, we chose to use the law by [Clemente et al.](#page-19-22) [\(2004\)](#page-19-22).

For H₂, the law most used in the literature we reviewed is by [Hirschmann et al.](#page-19-21) [\(2012\)](#page-19-21), who carry out experiments at $0.7 \le P \le 3$ GPa and $1400 \le T \le 1500$ °C, and give two expressions, for basaltic and andesitic melt. Their law for basaltic melt is in excellent agreement with that given by [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12) for BSE melt up to $P \sim 1$ GPa, and so is, to a slightly lesser extent, their andesitic melt law. At higher pressures, however, they diverge, with [Suer et al.](#page-21-12) [\(2023\)](#page-21-12) predicting Henrian behaviour to arbitrary pressure, while [Hirschmann et al.](#page-19-21) [\(2012\)](#page-19-21)'s laws predict a decline in solubility as pressure increases, consistently with their experimental results.

As the laws given in [Hirschmann et al.](#page-19-21) [\(2012\)](#page-19-21) have a robust high-pressure experimental background, we use those, and here, specifically, the basaltic melt case.

For H2O, there is a great deal of experimental data on the solubility in silicate melts (e.g., [Stolper](#page-21-32) [1982;](#page-21-32) [Silver](#page-21-33) [et al.](#page-21-33) [1990;](#page-21-33) [Moore et al.](#page-20-37) [1995;](#page-20-37) [Dixon et al.](#page-19-36) [1995;](#page-19-36) [Papale et al.](#page-20-35) [2006;](#page-20-35) [Iacono-Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [2012;](#page-20-17) [Sossi et al.](#page-21-34) [2023\)](#page-21-34), a complete review of which is beyond the scope of this work. We focus here on two solubility laws: [Sossi et al.](#page-21-34) [\(2023\)](#page-21-34), the most recent law available, and [Iacono-Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [\(2012\)](#page-20-17), which is the one we choose to implement in our study. [Sossi et al.](#page-21-34) [\(2023\)](#page-21-34) provide two slightly different estimates depending on the value of the molar absorption coefficient ϵ_{3550} , each depending linearly on the square roots of the atmospheric fugacities of both water and molecular hydrogen. These are the result of experiments carried out at very low pressure $(P = 1 \text{ atm})$ and high temperature $(T = 2173 \text{ K})$.

Higher-pressure experiments are carried out in [Iacono-Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [\(2012\)](#page-20-17), who also propose a solubility law, calibrated upon a vast but low-temperature experimental database $(10^2 \le P \le 10^4$ bar, $1100 \le T \le 1400^{\circ}$ C), which is in rough agreement with that of [Sossi et al.](#page-21-34) (2023) for an H_2 -rich envelope.

The fact that [Sossi et al.](#page-21-34) [\(2023\)](#page-21-34)'s law depends on a linear combination of the square roots of the fugacities of both H² and H2O, however, risks breaking element conservation for oxygen: indeed, it would predict some dissolved O in the magma even if no O is present – in any species – in the initial atmospheric composition. This effect is expected to be particularly relevant at the very reduced conditions explored here, where the abundance of O is expected to be low.

We thus consider extrapolating the law of [Iacono-Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [\(2012\)](#page-20-17) to higher temperatures to be a more accurate prescription than extrapolating that by [Sossi et al.](#page-21-34) [\(2023\)](#page-21-34) to high pressures, and hence do so here, assuming an Etna basalt composition for the melt. This choice is also consistent with that in [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12).

A.4. Summary

Data on solubility in silicate melt are available, at some conditions, for several species of interest, with the one exception being NH₃, for which we were unable to find any solubility laws. We list the bibliography on solubility laws and/or data points we have explored for this study in Table [2,](#page-26-0) and we show a selection of them in Figure [9.](#page-25-0) In general, the scenario explored in this study, relevant for magma oceans on temperate gas dwarfs, is extreme in a threefold way: it leads to high temperatures (T \gtrsim 2500 K), high pressures (P \gtrsim 10⁵ bar), and very reduced melts compared to Earth $(\Delta I W \lesssim -5)$. There is no data, for any species, at such conditions in all three ways. Only for N₂ data at both very high temperature and pressure exists, but that is for relatively oxidised conditions [\(Roskosz et al.](#page-21-30) [2013\)](#page-21-30). High-pressure $(P \ge 10^5$ bar) simulations exist for CO₂, but only at $T \le 2273$. For S₂, for a co-existing fluid phase, high-pressure data only exists at low temperature, and only for carbonate-silicate melt [\(Woodland et al.](#page-21-31) [2019\)](#page-21-31). All other species seem to lack high-pressure data.

Exploring this region of the parameter space, either experimentally or through simulations, will be crucial for improving our understanding of potential magma oceans in sub-Neptunes, and our ability to lift observational degeneracies with other possible internal structures.

B. SENSITIVITY TO ATMOSPHERIC PARAMETERS

As described in Section [4.5,](#page-15-0) we explore a range of values for three key atmospheric parameters that could influence the observable composition: the metallicity, the eddy diffusion coefficient K_{zz} , and the internal temperature T_{int} . Our canonical cases, shown in Figure [7,](#page-13-1) correspond to P -T profiles C2 and C3 with median metallicity of $50 \times$ solar, with and without elemental depletion respectively, and K_{zz} of $10^6 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ in the deep atmosphere. We investigate if a higher metallicity, a broader range of K_{zz} values and/or a higher T_{int} could better match the observed abundances than our canonical cases, for example with higher $CO₂$ abundance. We therefore consider models with higher metallicities of $100\times$ solar and $300\times$ solar, and two end-member scenarios of $10^4 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ and $10^8 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ for K_{zz} in the deep, convective region. We also consider the effect of using a higher value of T_{int} of 60 K, as previously considered by [Hu](#page-20-29) [\(2021\)](#page-20-29). Disequilibrium effects due to photochemistry and vertical mixing are included in all cases discussed here.

We start with investigating departures from the canonical C2 case, as shown in Figure [7.](#page-13-1) We first fix the K_{zz} profile to that used in the canonical case and vary the metallicity as described above. The resulting vertical mixing ratio profiles are shown in Figure [10,](#page-27-0) along with those for $50\times$ metallicity from Figure [7](#page-13-1) for comparison. For both the $100\times$ and $300\times$ solar cases, the abundance of $CO₂$ remains lower than that of CO throughout the atmosphere, as for the $50\times$ solar case. Similarly, the CO_2 and NH₃ abundances are inconsistent with the retrieved values in the photosphere, between ∼0.01-10 mbar, in all cases. Additionally, the CH⁴ abundance for 300× solar metallicity is higher than the retrieved abundance.

Next we consider a range of K_{zz} values in the deep atmosphere, using the C2 P-T profile. We vary K_{zz} at $P > 0.5$ bar from 10^4 to $10^8 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$, with our canonical value at $10^6 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$. The metallicity remains fixed at the canonical value of $50\times$ solar. As shown in Figure [11,](#page-28-0) both the higher and lower K_{zz} values negligibly affect the computed mixing

Figure 9. Behaviour of selected solubility laws in silicate melt for some prominent molecules. Solid blue lines indicate the laws used in this study. All temperature-dependent laws are shown here for $T = 3000$ K; the $\Delta \text{IW-dependent N}_2$ and S₂ laws are shown for $\Delta I W = -6.4$; all laws with free composition-dependent parameters are shown for the Mt. Etna basalt composition [\(Iacono-Marziano et al.](#page-20-17) [2012\)](#page-20-17). For H₂O, we label as (a) the law given in [Sossi et al.](#page-21-34) [\(2023\)](#page-21-34) for $\epsilon_{3550} = 6.3 \text{ m}^2/\text{mol}$, and as (b) that for $\epsilon_{3550} = 5.1 \text{ m}^2/\text{mol}$. The mixing ratio of each species, informed by Section [4.3,](#page-12-0) is indicated in the title of the respective subplot; the x-axis indicates total pressure. The gases are treated ideally, i.e. we take the fugacity of each species' to be equal to its partial pressure. We do not plot the CH₄ solubility, for which [Ardia et al.](#page-18-2) (2013) – whose law we use – predicts a much lower value than the other carbon-bearing species, nor the solubility of H₂S, for which both [Clemente et al.](#page-19-22) [\(2004\)](#page-19-22) and [Lesne](#page-20-36) [et al.](#page-20-36) [\(2015\)](#page-20-36) predict much lower solubility than for S_2

Species	Reference	Temperature (K)	Pressure (bar)
N_2	Dasgupta et al. (2022)	$1323 \le T \le 2700$	$1 \le P \le 8.2 \times 10^4$
N_2	Gao et al. (2022)	$1473 \le T \le 1873$	$3 \times 10^3 \le P \le 8 \times 10^4$
N_2	Bernadou et al. (2021)	$1473 \le T \le 1573$	$8 \times 10^2 \le P \le 10^4$
N_2	Boulliung et al. (2020)	$T = 1698$	$P=1$
N_2	Mallik et al. (2018)	1323 < T < 1573	2×10^4 $\leq P \leq 4 \times 10^4$
N_2	Roskosz et al. (2013)	$2500 \le T \le 2800$	$1.8 \times 10^4 \leq T \leq 1.48 \times 10^5$
N_2	Miyazaki et al. (2004)	$1573 \le T \le 1823$	$1 \leq T \leq 2 \times 10^3$
N_2	Libourel et al. (2003)	$1673 \le T \le 1698$	${\cal P}=1$
CO ₂	Suer et al. (2023)	$T = 2273$	$1 < P < 10^2$
CO ₂	Guillot & Sator $(2011)^{a}$	$1473 \le T \le 2273$	$10^3 \leq P \leq 1.5 \times 10^5$
CO ₂	Pan et al. (1991)	$1443 \le T \le 1873$	$10^3 \le P \le 1.5 \times 10^4$
CO ₂ , H ₂ O	Iacono-Marziano et al. (2012)	$1373 \le T \le 1673$	$10^2 < P < 10^4$
CO ₂ , H ₂ O	Papale et al. (2006)	$1073 \le T \le 1973$	$191 \le P \le 3.5 \times 10^4$
CO ₂ , H ₂ O	Dixon et al. (1995)	$T = 1473$	$2.01 \times 10^2 \le P \le 9.8 \times 10^2$
H_2O	Sossi et al. (2023)	$T = 2173$	$P=1$
H_2O	Moore et al. (1995)	$973 \le T \le 1473$	$1 < P < 2 \times 10^3$
H_2O	Silver et al. (1990)	$1123 \le T \le 1723$	$49 \le P \le 2 \times 10^4$
$\rm CO$	Yoshioka et al. (2019)	1473 < T < 1873	$2.08 \times 10^3 \le P \le 3 \times 10^4$
CO	Armstrong et al. (2015)	$T = 1673$	$P = 1.2 \times 10^4$
CH_4	Ardia et al. (2013)	$1673 \le T \le 1723$	$7 \times 10^3 \le P \le 3 \times 10^4$
S_2	Boulliung & Wood (2023)	$1473 \le T \le 1773$	$P=1$
S_2	Gaillard et al. $(2022)^{b}$	$1073 \le T \le 1673$	$P=1$
S_2	Woodland et al. $(2019)^c$	$1673 \le T \le 1873$	$5 \times 10^4 \le P \le 1.05 \times 10^5$
S_2	O'Neill & Mavrogenes (2002)	$T = 1673$	$P=1$
H_2S	Lesne et al. (2015)	$1323 \le T \le 1473$	$250 \leq P \leq 2 \times 10^3$
H_2S , SO_2	Clemente et al. (2004)	$1073 \le T \le 1273$	$P = 2 \times 10^3$
H_2	Hirschmann et al. (2012)	$1673 \le T \le 1773$	$7\times 10^3 \leq P \leq 3\times 10^4$

Table 2. Sources of solubility data and laws considered in this study. The (total) pressure and temperature ranges indicated are those corresponding to the experiments carried out in the respective studies, or, if the studies calibrate a solubility law based on data from previous works, the range spanned by those.

^a: Molecular dynamics simulation.

^b: [Gaillard et al.](#page-19-12) [\(2022\)](#page-19-12) state that their law is calibrated against data obtained with gas at a pressure of one atmosphere. However, they refer to [Zajacz et al.](#page-21-35) [\(2013\)](#page-21-35), whose experiments were carried out at 200 MPa.

^c: For carbonate-silicate melt.

ratios at observable pressures. Increasing K_{zz} shifts the quench point to higher (deeper) pressures, as shown by the mixing ratio profile for $CO₂$ in the right-hand panel of Figure [11.](#page-28-0)

We now consider the hotter $P-T$ profile case with NH₃ depletion due to magma; this is the C3 profile with 30% silicates, as discussed above. The higher metallicities of $100\times$ and $300\times$ solar are implemented by proportionately enhancing the canonical elemental abundances for this case. These originally corresponded to $50\times$ solar, hence we increase the relevant elemental abundances in Table [1](#page-10-1) by factors of 2 and 6, respectively. The results are shown in Figure [12.](#page-28-1) As for the C2 profile, the predicted $CO₂$ abundance remains significantly below the retrieved value in both cases, with the CO mixing ratio exceeding that of CO_2 throughout the atmosphere. The CH₄ abundance for $300\times$ solar metallicity is additionally too high compared to the retrieved abundance.

As an end-member case, we consider each of the C2 and C3 profiles discussed above and adopt our extreme values of 300×solar metallicity and $K_{zz} = 10^8$ cm²s⁻¹ in the deep atmosphere. The resulting vertical mixing ratio profiles are shown in Figure [13](#page-29-0) along with the canonical cases. These end-member cases are similarly unable to match the retrieved CO_2 abundance constraints. A higher K_{zz} would further increase the abundances of both CO and CO_2 , however CO remains more abundant than $CO₂$.

Figure 10. Effect of enhanced metallicity on the vertical mixing ratio profiles for several H-C-O-N-S molecular species with the C2 P -T profile. Dotted lines show the profile from the left-hand side of Figure [7,](#page-13-1) for C2 with 30% silicates, equivalent to $50\times$ solar elemental abundances. Left: solid lines indicate the corresponding profiles for $100\times$ solar metallicity. Right: solid lines indicate the corresponding profiles for $300 \times$ solar metallicity.

Thus far we have considered values of 25 K and 50 K for T_{int} , corresponding the C2 and C3 profiles, respectively. Lastly, we explore the effect of increasing T_{int} to a higher value of 60 K for completeness, as has been considered by other works for K2-18 b (e.g. [Hu](#page-20-29) [2021\)](#page-20-29). We adopt the P-T profile of Hu [\(2021\)](#page-20-29) with $100\times$ solar metallicity, extrapolated to higher pressures (1000 bar) using an adiabat. We consider two cases: 1) $100 \times$ solar metallicity with depletion (i.e. twice the C3 30% silicates abundances from Table [1\)](#page-10-1) and our canonical K_{zz} treatment, and 2) a high $K_{zz} = 10^8 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ and a high metallicity of 300× solar (i.e. 6× the C3 30% silicates abundances). With the canonical K_{zz} , we find that the computed CO abundance exceeds the retrieved upper limit, while the computed CO₂ abundance remains significantly lower than the retrieved abundance. The retrieved CH_4 abundance and NH_3 upper limits can be explained by this model. For the high K_{zz} and high metallicity case, the computed CO abundance similarly exceeds the retrieved abundance. In this case the retrieved $CO₂$ abundance can be explained by the model. However, the computed CH₄ abundance exceeds the retrieved value. Due to the higher temperatures in this P -T profile, the H₂O abundance exceeds the retrieved value for both cases of metallicity and K_{zz} considered.

Overall, we have explored a wide parameter space for the atmospheric chemistry, considering a range of values for K_{zz} , metallicity and T_{int} . In this exploration, we do not find a case resulting in $CO_2 > CO$ that would satisfy the retrieved atmospheric abundance constraints for K2-18 b [\(Madhusudhan et al.](#page-20-2) [2023b\)](#page-20-2).

Figure 11. Effect of varying K_{zz} on the vertical mixing ratio profiles for several H-C-O-N-S molecular species for the C2 P -T profile. Dotted lines show the profile from the left-hand side of Figure [7,](#page-13-1) for C2 with 30% silicates, equivalent to $50\times$ solar elemental abundances with our canonical treatment of K_{zz} , with a value of $10^6 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ in the deep atmosphere. Left: solid lines indicate the corresponding profiles with a lower $K_{zz} = 10^4 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ in the deep atmosphere. Right: solid lines indicate the corresponding profiles with a higher $K_{zz} = 10^8 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ in the deep atmosphere.

Figure 12. Effect of enhanced metallicity on the vertical mixing ratio profiles for several H-C-O-N-S molecular species with the C3 P-T profile. Dotted lines show the profile from the right-hand side of Figure [7,](#page-13-1) for C3 with 30% silicates, with N depletion due to the presence of magma. Left: solid lines indicate the corresponding profiles for $100 \times \text{solar metallicity}$, i.e. $2\times$ the respective elemental abundances given in Table [1.](#page-10-1) Right: solid lines indicate the corresponding profiles for $300\times$ solar metallicity, i.e. $6 \times$ the respective elemental abundances in Table [1.](#page-10-1)

Figure 13. Effect of high metallicity and high K_{zz} on the vertical mixing ratio profiles for several H-C-O-N-S molecular species. Dotted lines show the canonical profiles from Figure [7.](#page-13-1) Left: solid lines indicate the profiles with the C2 P-T profile with 300×solar abundance and $K_{zz} = 10^8$ cm²s⁻¹ in the deep atmosphere. Right: solid lines indicate the profiles with the C3 P-T profile with $6\times$ the elemental abundances from Table [1,](#page-10-1) i.e. equivalent to 300×solar abundance, and $K_{zz} = 10^8 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ in the deep atmosphere.

Figure 14. Effect of higher T_{int} on the vertical mixing ratio profiles for several H-C-O-N-S molecular species. We adopt the P-T profile from [Hu](#page-20-29) [\(2021\)](#page-20-29) with T_{int} of 60 K and 100 \times solar metallicity, extrapolated to 1000 bar. Dotted lines show the canonical profiles using the hotter C3 profile from Figure [7.](#page-13-1) Left: solid lines indicate profiles assuming $100 \times$ solar metallicity including N depletion, adopting $K_{zz} = 10^6$ cm²s⁻¹ in the deep atmosphere, for the [Hu](#page-20-29) [\(2021\)](#page-20-29) P-T profile. Right: solid lines indicate profiles assuming $300 \times$ solar metallicity including N depletion, adopting $K_{zz} = 10^8 \text{ cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ in the deep atmosphere, for the [Hu](#page-20-29) (2021) *P-T* profile.