

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}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}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}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}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}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.

C2