

Supplement of *Clim. Past*, 11, 1507–1525, 2015
<http://www.clim-past.net/11/1507/2015/>
doi:10.5194/cp-11-1507-2015-supplement
© Author(s) 2015. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



Climate
of the Past

Open Access

The EGU logo features the letters 'EGU' in a bold, sans-serif font, with a circular arrow graphic behind the 'E'.

Supplement of

Stratification of surface waters during the last glacial millennial climatic events: a key factor in subsurface and deep-water mass dynamics

M. Wary et al.

Correspondence to: M. Wary (melanie.wary@u-bordeaux.fr)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the CC-BY 3.0 licence.

Why interpreting the reconstructed planktonic foraminiferal temperature signal as relative subsurface temperature variations is coherent in our study area?

In the present study, we reconstruct oceanic temperatures by applying a transfer function to planktonic foraminifera assemblages. This transfer function uses a modern database where annual and seasonal oceanic temperatures are extracted at 10 meters water depth. In such a configuration, the reconstructed temperatures are, or should be a priori, assumed to represent sea-surface temperatures (SST).

However, the comparison of our foraminifera-derived temperature (F-Temp) signals with our dinocyst-derived SST signals (reconstructed by applying a similar transfer function to dinocyst assemblages) shows strong discrepancies. Studies dealing with SST reconstructions obtained through different methods (e.g. Mg/Ca on planktonic foraminifera shells, relative abundance of planktonic foraminifera index species, alkenone index UK'37, transfer functions applied to assemblages of planktonic foraminifera, dinocysts, diatoms, coccoliths, etc.) are generally also confronted to similar discrepancies (e.g. Mazaud et al., 2002; Sicre et al., 2005; de Vernal et al., 2005, 2006; Peck et al., 2008; Penaud et al., 2011). To explain it, the authors usually call for differences in growth season and/or in depth habitat of the associated organisms, and/or for interannual variability, and/or for allochthonous advection. In the case of dinocyst-derived versus planktonic foraminifera-derived temperature reconstructions, many studies have mainly attributed these discrepancies to changes in depth habitat (e.g. de Vernal et al., 2005, 2006; Penaud et al., 2011).

In our case, such an explanation is strongly coherent from an ecological point of view, given that:

- 1) While dinoflagellates, as part of the phytoplankton, are restricted to the photic layer (Sarjeant, 1974), heterotrophic planktonic foraminifera may live deeper (e.g. Schiebel et al., 2001). This is particularly true for the main species composing our foraminiferal assemblages since they do not bear any symbiont.
- 2) Our dinocyst-derived SSS (sea-surface salinity) records indicate the presence of a low saline surface layer throughout the last glacial period (mean of 31 and 32 psu for summer and winter SSS respectively). However, the planktonic foraminifera species identified in our assemblages (Table S1) barely tolerate such salinities (Tolderlund and Bé, 1971).

Hence, given the ecological tolerances of the identified planktonic foraminifera species, it seems consistent to relate planktonic foraminifera assemblages to a depth habitat deeper than the one of dinocysts.

However, as SST in the modern planktonic foraminifera database are extracted at 10 m water depth, it is a priori incoherent to interpret the reconstructed F-Temp as subsurface temperatures. Nonetheless, according to previous works focused on transfer functions (using the modern analog technique) applied to planktonic foraminifera assemblages, it seems reasonable to interpret the F-Temp signals as relative variations of subsurface temperatures in our study area.

Indeed, for transfer functions *sensu lato*, the reference living-depth of foraminifera to consider in modern SST training sets is really problematic and its definition not trivial. Numerous tests were previously done on this question. Among them, Pflaumann et al. (1996) have demonstrated that such a consideration does not provide significant differences in the reconstructed F-Temp. Telford et al.

(2013) showed that “*For cores north of 25°N, the [paleo]reconstructions from different depths and seasons resemble one another, with an offset*”, implying that **even if we have chosen another extraction depth for SST, the relative variations of our signals would be very similar.**

Furthermore, even if Telford et al. (2013) evidenced that for sites in the North Atlantic drift (including the nearby site NA87-22; cf. page 862) paleoreconstructions at all depth are statistically significant, he also argue that “*the most ecologically relevant depth varies in space and time, and the assemblages will probably integrate the communities from several depths and seasons, so selecting a more appropriate fixed depth for temperature reconstructions for each location is probably not trivial and does not completely circumvent the problem.*”. This latter statement is also supported by Adloff et al. (2011): “*The currently used technique to reconstruct temperature from planktonic foraminifera [by extracting SST averaged over a depth interval depending on the living depth of the foraminifera species identified] is likely inadequate for time periods when the vertical temperature gradient was different from today*”. Hence, it appears that **there is no valuable reason to define a depth or a depth section (for the extraction of SST in the modern database) as more appropriate than another one, particularly because it must have evolved through time.**

Therefore, in our study area, it seems coherent to interpret the F-Temp signals – reconstructed from modern SST extracted at 10 m water depth – as relative variations of “subsurface” temperatures. The “subsurface” depth range is however difficult to define, but we can reasonably suppose that F-Temp signals are integrated over the potential depth range of the whole assemblage (i.e. 0-300 meters water depth here).

Such an assumption allows for the conciliation of our phytoplanktonic-derived versus zooplanktonic-derived signals, i.e. the reconstructed hydrological parameters as well as the environmental information carried by the respective assemblages (characterized by communities which ecologically do not sound as belonging to a common environment / water mass). Thus, it allows us to provide a constructive view of what can be interpreted from the strong difference calculated.

References:

- Adloff, F., Mikolajewicz, U., Kučera, M., Grimm, R., Maier-Reimer, E., Schmiedl, G., and Emeis, K. C.: Upper ocean climate of the Eastern Mediterranean Sea during the Holocene Insolation Maximum - A model study, *Climate of the Past*, 7, 1103-1122, 2011.
- de Vernal, A., Eynaud, F., Henry, M., Hillaire-Marcel, C., Londeix, L., Mangin, S., Matthiessen, J., Marret, F., Radi, T., Rochon, A., Solignac, S., and Turon, J. L.: Reconstruction of sea-surface conditions at middle to high latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere during the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) based on dinoflagellate cyst assemblages, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 24, 897-924, 2005.
- de Vernal, A., Rosell-Melé, A., Kucera, M., Hillaire-Marcel, C., Eynaud, F., Weinelt, M., Dokken, T., and Kageyama, M.: Comparing proxies for the reconstruction of LGM sea-surface conditions in the northern North Atlantic, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 25, 2820-2834, 2006.
- Mazaud, A., Sicre, M. A., Ezat, U., Pichon, J. J., Duprat, J., Laj, C., Kissel, C., Beaufort, L., Michel, E., and Turon, J. L.: Geomagnetic-assisted stratigraphy and sea surface temperature changes in core MD94-103 (Southern Indian Ocean): Possible implications for North-South climatic relationships around H4, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 201, 159-170, 2002.
- Peck, V. L., Hall, I. R., Zahn, R., and Elderfield, H.: Millennial-scale surface and subsurface paleothermometry from the northeast Atlantic, 55-8 ka BP, *Paleoceanography*, 23, PA3221, doi:10.1029/2008PA001631, 2008.
- Penaud, A., Eynaud, F., Voelker, A., Kageyama, M., Marret, F., Turon, J. L., Blamart, D., Mulder, T., and Rossignol, L.: Assessment of sea surface temperature changes in the Gulf of Cadiz during the last 30 ka: Implications for glacial changes in the regional hydrography, *Biogeosciences*, 8, 2295-2316, 2011.
- Pflaumann, U., Duprat, J., Pujol, C., and Labeyrie, L. D.: SIMMAX: A modern analog technique to deduce Atlantic sea surface temperatures from planktonic foraminifera in deep-sea sediments, *Paleoceanography*, 11, 15-35, 1996.
- Sarjeant, W. A. S.: *Fossil and living dinoflagellates*, Elsevier, London, UK, 2013.
- Schiebel, R., Waniek, J., Bork, M., and Hemleben, C.: Planktic foraminiferal production stimulated by chlorophyll redistribution and entrainment of nutrients, *Deep-Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 48, 721-740, 2001.
- Sicre, M. A., Labeyrie, L., Ezat, U., Duprat, J., Turon, J. L., Schmidt, S., Michel, E., and Mazaud, A.: Mid-latitude Southern Indian Ocean response to Northern Hemisphere Heinrich events, *Earth and Planetary Science Letters*, 240, 724-731, 2005.
- Telford, R. J., Li, C., and Kucera, M.: Mismatch between the depth habitat of planktonic foraminifera and the calibration depth of SST transfer functions may bias reconstructions, *Climate of the Past*, 9, 859-870, 2013.
- Tolderlund, D. S. and Bé, A. W. H.: Seasonal Distribution of Planktonic Foraminifera in the Western North Atlantic, *Micropaleontology*, 17, 297-329, 1971.