

## ***Interactive comment on “Moving beyond the age-depth model paradigm in deep sea palaeoclimate archives: dual radiocarbon and stable isotope analysis on single foraminifera” by Bryan C. Lougheed et al.***

**J. Gottschalk**

julia.gottschalk@geo.unibe.ch

Received and published: 27 October 2017

Dear Authors,

I have read your CPD contribution with great interest. Your study site is “ideal” to emphasize the influence of bioturbation on proxy data, and I agree that it is important to correct for these biases with adequate approaches (you present a novel and elegant one).

As there is very little specific information on sample sizes and data correction/post-

C1

processing in the text and in the supplement (e.g., in Table S1), I wonder how contamination (that has increasing impact with smaller sample size) contributes to the  $^{14}\text{C}$  age differences of samples observed in your core (e.g., Brown and Southon, 1997; Hua et al., 2004). If corrections have been made without considering a size-dependent influence from contamination, different sample aliquots with a large size range (from ultra-small to normal size) can have significantly different  $^{14}\text{C}$  ages. This difference of course depends on the range of the sample sizes and the age of the sample, and will not compensate for the large bioturbation-driven  $^{14}\text{C}$  differences you observe. However, given the absence of specific information on samples sizes, I wonder whether it plays a role, in particular for some data points in Figure 2A. The blank seems to have been obtained on small samples ( $\sim 50 \mu\text{g C}$ ) so that data of samples with a size very different from the blank may be slightly over- or undercorrected on the basis of a size-independent, constant blank. Could you provide information on samples sizes and whether correction for contamination was applied or was not required to stress that  $^{14}\text{C}$  age differences in sediment core T86-10P are driven by bioturbation?

### References

Brown, T.A., Southon, J.R., 1997. Corrections for contamination background in AMS  $^{14}\text{C}$  measurements. *Nucl. Instruments Methods Phys. Res. Sect. B Beam Interact. with Mater. Atoms* 123, 208–213. doi:10.1016/S0168-583X(96)00676-3

Hua, Q., Zoppi, U., Williams, A.A., Smith, A.M., 2004. Small-mass AMS radiocarbon analysis at ANTARES. *Nucl. Instruments Methods Phys. Res. Sect. B Beam Interact. with Mater. Atoms* 223-224, 284–292. doi:10.1016/j.nimb.2004.04.057

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2017-119>, 2017.