

# ***Interactive comment on “Pliocene diatom and sponge spicule oxygen isotope ratios from the Bering Sea: isotopic offsets and future directions”*** **by A. M. Snelling et al.**

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 20 May 2014

This short paper presents a preliminary result of oxygen isotope analysis of biogenic opal from the Bering Sea. It indicates no isotope offset in different size fraction of diatom, and some similarity between  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  for pure sponge spicules calculated by mass balance and a global stacked benthic  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -foram record. The oxygen isotope analysis of siliceous sponge has been rarely reported, and the previous studies suggested that sponge does not form its siliceous spicules in oxygen isotopic equilibrium with ambient water. Thus, the data showing the possibility of  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge as paleoenvironmental proxy are very interesting and should be published after minor revision below.

1) The authors calculated the  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  value for pure sponge spicule by mass balancing using the relative abundance of sponge spicules in the  $> 38\mu\text{m}$  fraction and  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



diatom obtained from the corresponding diatom-rich 3-15  $\mu\text{m}$  fraction. But, it should be better to use the volume ratio of silica between diatom frustules and sponge spicules for the accurate calculation of  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  value for pure sponge. If authors used the area ratio between diatom frustules and sponge spicules in the microscopic field, the relative abundance of sponge would be underestimated compared to that based on volume ratio, and the calculated difference between  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge and  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -diatom could be overestimated (also the calculated fluctuation of  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge could be overestimated). This is because the sponge spicule generally seems to have more massive structure compared to that of diatom frustule, and the thickness of the sponge spicule also seems to be thicker than that of diatom frustule. Authors should concern and discuss the error of calculated  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge caused by the difference between volume ratio and area ratio. Further more, if authors used the relative abundance of number of frustules and spicules in the  $> 38\mu\text{m}$  fraction, the value of the “relative abundance” is no longer quantitative for the calculation. Please explain what type of “relative abundance” was used in more detail.

2) As described in P2092, L3, a linear relationship between the magnitude of the isotope offset and the sponge spicule content would indicate that the offset is driven by the relative abundance of siliceous sponge material. But, the strong correlation could be attributed to that the offset is usually constant in the value calculated by extrapolating sponge abundance to 100 %. And, the sponge abundance increased at glacial stage. The constant offset between  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge and  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -diatom and increased sponge abundance at glacial stage also could result in the  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge trend similar to that of the global stacked  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  curve. Please consider this possibility.

3) The authors indicated that the similar trend between the  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge and  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -diatom. On the other hand, the  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -diatom value increased from 2.713 Ma to 2.541 Ma. There appears to no correlation between the  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -diatom change and the global stacked benthic  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -foram record. Did authors have any idea for the trend of  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -diatom? Please discuss not only the trend of the  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge but also  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -diatom.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Or show the graph of  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -diatom with age and mention the trend at least.

The followings are minor comments:

P2090, L9, The year, 2013, may not be needed for personal communication.

P2090, L20, Does the proportion mean number of frustules or area ratio?

P2090, L22, How much of weight of sample was analyzed for one analysis?

P2094, L 18, As noted above, the variation of  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ -sponge could be over estimated because of the mass balance calculation using the relative area or specimens ratio of sponge spicules.

Table S1, The  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  of sample (BS348–BS351) in the 3–15  $\mu\text{m}$  fraction is not shown, but the  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  of pure sponge is calculated. How were these values calculated?

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 10, 2087, 2014.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)