

Interactive comment on “A biomarker record of Lake El’gygytgyn, far east Russian Arctic: investigating sources of organic matter and carbon cycling during marine isotope stages 1–3” by A. R. Holland et al.

A. R. Holland et al.

aholland@geo.umass.edu

Received and published: 17 December 2012

[Responses are in brackets]

I. General comment: The paper submitted by Holland et al. addresses the abundance and carbon isotopic signature of lipid biomarkers recovered from the high-latitude Lake El’gygytgyn (covering the past ca. 60ka). Their main research questions relate to evidence for anoxia in the water column during the glacial intervals and identification of OM sources driving the bulk sediment isotopic signature. Other than expected and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



in contrast to previous studies, the authors find no specific isotopic or biomarker evidence for water column anoxia. Based on their biomarker and compound-specific isotope analyses, they identify a mixture of terrestrial and aquatic sources contributing to the organic matter during the investigated interval. This well-written paper addresses questions that are within the scope of *Climate of the Past*. Scientific approach and the applied methods are good and suitable while the presentation is overall clear. Figures are well prepared and cover the presented information adequately – I especially enjoyed the clearly arranged table with GC specifications.

II. Specific comments: I would appreciate some information in the introduction, why sediments from MIS 1- 3 were investigated (considering that the core is longer), why are they so important? Additionally it would be helpful to be introduced to the term “LLGM” in the introduction as well. At the moment, LLGM is first explained in section 4, but the term is used earlier. My suggestion is to move p. 4636 lines 5-10 to some adequate place in the introduction. [Additional information to clarify the importance of MIS 1-3 was added to the third paragraph of the introduction. The explanation of the LLGM was moved to the introduction and now appears in the last paragraph of the introduction.]

If I understand the authors correctly in section 2.4, they used the internal standard C36 n-alkane (added before extraction) for quantification of the n-alkanes and the same compound, added as external standard for quantification of the FAMEs and TMS-esters of n-alcohols. Quantification of compounds based on internal standards is critical in my opinion, because some material is always lost during extraction and separation of fractions. Comparison of concentrations between different compound classes is hampered by mixing quantification via external and internal standards. Was any external standard used to evaluate the performance of GC and GC-irmMS? [The text referring to the isotope analysis in section 2.4 was reworded for clarity. We note that a known quantity of the C36 n-alkane was added to the TLE as a recovery standard (and this ended up in the apolar fraction after column chromatography). Yields of the recovery standard were

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

Interactive
Comment

>99% for all samples. After column chromatography an additional known quantity of the C36 n-alkane was added as an internal standard to the other more polar fractions and used for quantification of compounds by GC-FID. External standards were used to evaluate the performance of the GC-IRMS. We ran our compound-specific isotope samples at Yale University and now include a reference Tipple and Pagani (2010) in the 4th paragraph of section 2.4 that details the procedures used in that laboratory.]

Are $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ measurements of different compound classes single measurements or replicates,? If these are replicate measurements, please give mean values and standard deviation for all samples. [The $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ measurements represent single sample runs. Accuracy was determined through standard deviation of an internal standard and consistency of a set of external standards. Detailed information regarding the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ measurements now appears in section 2.4.]

The authors should address mean value, standard deviation and accuracy of the n-alkane standard more carefully. [The text in section 2.4 has been revised for clarity.]

Please, check the reported concentrations of compounds. All tables give μg component / g TLE, the text describes ng/g TLE. How much information can be drawn when relating concentrations to g TLE? The total amount of total lipid extract depends on several variables (TOC content, amount of extractable organic matter, amount of extracted sediment). To be able to compare the reported values to results from other studies the authors should either use amount / g sed or amount /g TOC. [As is now noted in the text, we chose to report biomarker concentration in terms of amount compound per gram total lipid extract ($\mu\text{g}/\text{g}$ TLE) because the extractable component of sedimentary OM (the TLE) is a small portion of the TOC. However, we note that similar results are obtained when reporting concentrations relative to g TOC or g TLE. In order to demonstrate the similarity between reporting in /g TOC and /g TLE, the full dataset in μg / g TOC are added to the Supplementary Information.]

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

Interactive
Comment

Would it be possible to calculate accumulation rates of the different compounds? This could make identification of changes in terrigenous vs. lacustrine / bacterial OM easier. [Mass accumulation rates are already presented in Figure 2b.]

Currently, the term “LLGM” is introduced in the discussion to differentiate the region of Lake El’gygytyn from other Arctic regions. I would look forward to a part where these regional phenomena are put into a broader perspective, e.g., in comparison with other Arctic sites. This could be a good addition to the conclusions. [We have now added an additional section to the discussion (section 4.6) that discusses the paleoenvironmental data gained by this study of Lake El’gygytyn into a regional and global paleoclimate context.]

As it is, I find the section 4 (pages 4636 and 4637) somewhat misleading. After re-reading the paper some times, I suppose it is meant as general introduction to the discussion. Initially, I was under the impression that some major points are only touched marginally, stated as facts or not discussed at all. I would suggest a re-structuring of this section, maybe in the same order as the following (subsequent) sections are arranged. Maybe even re-state specific questions that will be answered in the next sub-chapters. [An introductory paragraph to the discussion has been added to clarify the structure of the section (section 4.0).]

I would suggest to re-structure chapter 4.2 a bit by starting with a short overview which compounds indicate terrigenous input and which are of other (aquatic or bacterial) origin. Then discuss the individual compound classes and close with a short summarizing paragraph. Maybe even divide the section further into sub-sections (it is currently almost 4 pages long) or considering some moderate shortening. [We have added a new paragraph (section 2.5) providing background as to which compounds indicate terrigenous and aquatic input. We felt this background information was important to provide before presenting any of the results or discussion and thus we added this paragraph to section 2.]

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

Section 4.4 is not really related to the goals of the manuscript (evidence for water column anoxia and identification of sources of organic matter). Currently and oversimplified, the authors state that there is GDGT data giving ambiguous results, temperatures during the LLGM were cooler, as expected, and that a modern calibration in the watershed is needed. Based on figure 5 (there is no supplementary material on GDGT data to compare), I would say that there is at least one cold spell at 50ka, not related to the LLGM. I suggest to delete this section. [This section was combined with a discussion of Lake El'gygytyn in a paleoclimate context (section 4.6.2), in order to strengthen the connections to Climate of the Past. We did not state that the GDGT data is giving ambiguous results. While we are not able to calibrate to absolute temperature, relative temperature changes as revealed by this method are in good agreement with other temperature reconstructions both from Lake El'gygytyn and from other paleoecological proxies from Beringia. Our results, as well as the results of D'Anjou et al. (2012 – Climate of the Past), indicate that MBT/CBT is a promising technique for generating relative temperature records from Lake El'gygytyn. This is now stated clearly in section 4.6.2.]

Section 4.5 includes some repetition within 20 lines (p. 4645, lines 25 – 29; p. 4646, lines 8 -10). Please consider rewriting and shortening of this part, it contains valuable information. Later on (p. 4646, lines 15 to end of section), I cannot really follow the authors when they discuss the “somewhat surprising contribution to the depleted bulk $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ signal” as they have already noted before that there is some contribution of other that terrestrial sources to the OM pool. This could be presented in a more concise way. [We have revised this section to shorten it and remove repetitive text.]

As it is, I find that section 5 (conclusions) is mostly a summary of what has been said before but in large parts not a conclusion. It is roughly two pages long – too long in my opinion. My suggestion is to maybe start the conclusion with the paragraph on p. 4649, lines 24 to the end to underline the importance of this study to the community. [The conclusions section of the manuscript now has been shortened considerably.]

Section 2.2 – Page 4629 – Lines 6-10: Concerning the chronology: Judging from Figure 2a, I would say that the very last part of LZ1029 is too low in comparison to the increase in TOC visible in PG1351. If there is a good reason for this, maybe it become obvious when comparing the $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{bulk}}$ records of both cores? [The chronology of core LZ1029 is presented in another manuscript by Murdock et al. (2012) in the same special issue of *Climate of the Past*. This publication details the construction of the age model. The clarity of the reference to this paper has been improved (section 2.2).]

Section 2.2 – Page – 4629 – Lines 14-15: For the data discussed in this paper it seems to be not relevant how long cores LZ1024 and PG1351 are and how much time the respective cores cover. [Reference to the length of cores LZ1024 and PG1351 has been removed, as suggested.]

Section 3.1 – Page 4632 – Lines 24-25: Please give probability of correlation coefficients, are they statistically significant? [P-values have now been added and support a poor linear correlation of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values with %TOC and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values.]

Section 3.2.1 – Page – 4633 – Line 18: Please give $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value of sample at 38 kyr. [The $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value is now provided, as suggested.]

Section 3.2.3 – Page 4634 – Lines 26&27: Judging from figure 2, I would rather say that the increase in total n-alcohols starts after 38 ka, in agreement with the fatty acids. [We agree and have revised the text, as suggested (section 3.2.3).]

Section 3.2.3 – Page 4635 – Lines 1-3: Based on the data in the supplementary material C21 n-alkanol is fourth in abundance (out of five compounds) and therefore not one of the most abundant compounds. Please be more precise, every compound except the n-C26 alkanol is most abundant compound in one sample or the other. [The wording in this section has been changed to improve clarity, as suggested. Please note that other non-abundant alkanols are present but were not presented as part of this study.]

Section 3.2.4 – Page 4635 – Lines 18-25: If all other original data is summarized in

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

the supplementary material, why not the GDGTs? Please include in supplement. [The GDGT data is now included in the Supplementary Information, as suggested.]

Section 4.1 – Page 4638 – Lines 13-18: Is there any explanation why the environmental change in and around the lake is not captured in bulk % TOC and C/N records? If pollen records indicate almost exclusively herbaceous plants, this could explain the relative high abundance of the n-C31 alkane. [It is possible that the TOC peak may represent a change in the non-solvent extractable portion of the organic matter. This is now pointed out in this section.]

Section 4.2 – Page 4639 – Lines 17-19: Please be more specific, what kind of sites? Give references to support your statement. [Additional references have been added to section 4.2.]

Section 4.2 – Page 4630 – Lines 6-9: This record is not the first one to demonstrate that care should be taken when interpreting long-chain FAMES in sediments. Please cite other work here as has been done in lines 1&2 on this page. [References have been added noting the occurrence of long-chain FAMES from microalgal and bacterial sources in section 4.2.]

Section 4.2 – Page 4640 – Lines 14&15: What could be the possible aquatic source organism for n-C25 alkanes? [A possible source is aquatic macrophytes and this information has now been added to section 4.2 along with a reference.]

Section 4.2 – Page 4641 – Lines 3-6: Confusing to me, why C23 and C25-alkanes are referred to as showing trends in terrestrial sources, especially when it was indicated before that C25-alkanes can have an additional aquatic source. [This section has been reworded for improved clarity, as suggested.]

III. Technical comments Abstract – Page 4626 – Lines 7&13: Spelling of Lake El'gygytyn [The spelling has been corrected.]

Section 1 – Page 4627 – Lines 7&8: position of Lake El'gygytyn is 67°30'N and

172°05'E (see also in Figure 1; Layer, 2000, Meteorites and Planetary Sciences, v. 35, p. 591-599) [The location has been corrected, as suggested.]

Section 1 – Page 4628 – Line 10: Investigated sediments span the past 63 kyr, not 90 kyr. [The age of sediments has been corrected.]

Section 2.4 – Page 4630 – Line 10: Please add the mixing ratio of DCM:isopropyl alcohol. [The mixing ratio has been added, as suggested.]

Section 2.4 – Page 4630 – Line 24: . . . were identified on a Hewlett Packard (HP) 6890 series. . . [The suggested text has been added.]

Section 3.2.2 – Page 4634 – Line 19: ... were only obtained on one sample from within. . . [The text has been corrected, as suggested.]

Section 4.4 – Page – Line 18: Please complete Lake El'gygytyn. Please use either "kyr" or "ka", but do not mix both writings. [Text has been corrected to use "ka" when referring to thousands of years ago and "kyr" when referring to thousands of years.]

You have to decide whether you sort references in the text in alphabetical or temporal order, but do not mix both styles in the text. [Climate of the Past styles have been consulted, "In terms of short citations in the text, the ordering can be by relevance, as well as chronologically or alphabetically, depending on author's preference." The authors have chosen to list citations by relevance where appropriate.]

Decide whether you want to use n-alkanols or n-alcohols (e.g., see section 3.2.3) [The text has been revised to refer to n-alkanols rather than n-alcohols.]

I could not find the following references in the text: Hayes (1993), Layer (2000) [These references were both in the text. The Hayes (1993) reference was removed in revision of this manuscript and the Layer (2000) reference remains in section 1.0.]

Figure captions: Fig. 1: Location is 67°30'N, 172°05'E [The location has been corrected, as suggested.]

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Fig. 2: Give reference for TOC content in PG1351 (and add letter a after “relative to TOC”). Please explain the orange box. Was it drawn based on the age model? [The figure caption has been clarified, as suggested.]

Fig. 4: What is the green line in comparison to the green dots? [The green line denotes the 3 point running mean. This is now indicated in the figure caption.]

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 8, 4625, 2012.

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