

Interactive comment on “Insensitivity of alkenone carbon isotopes to atmospheric CO₂ at low to moderate CO₂ levels” by Marcus P. S. Badger et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 17 January 2019

This manuscript presents new alkenone-based pCO₂ data along with previously published 11B-based pCO₂ reconstructions from the same late-Pleistocene and Pliocene samples. This is a timely comparison and tackles the question of how well the alkenone CO₂ proxy as currently applied can reconstruct changes in CO₂ near modern pCO₂ levels. In an interesting exploration of the alkenone pCO₂ data, the authors present novel estimates for the input parameters that would allow the proxy to reconstruct known pCO₂ values. This exploration highlights some of the fundamental problems facing the alkenone pCO₂ proxy in its current form and will hopefully spark new work to better understand carbon isotopic fractionation by coccolithophore algae and its relationship to CO₂ concentrations. The manuscript is well written, novel, and will be of interest to a wide variety of scientists. The figures are generally easily interpreted and

C1

clear. There are not any major issues with the manuscript and for this reason I suggest to publish with minor revisions. Comments and suggestions for these revisions are described below.

My only substantial comment is that I think the authors should calculate the Pliocene pCO₂ values from the alkenone proxy with the cell size corrections added (and do the same for the Pleistocene samples for comparison). I realize this doesn't change the orbital-scale insensitivity in the Pleistocene. But, it does allow comparison of the absolute value and magnitude of change between the Pleistocene and Pliocene windows in both proxies. It will also change the posterior distributions of the input variables for the alkenone pCO₂ reconstructions. My sense is that it will bring the b-parameter, ϵ_f , and SST posteriors more in line with the priors. The lith size changes are on the order of 150 to 200% higher in the Pliocene with respect to the Pleistocene (it appears from the figure). That is substantial and would increase the estimated Pliocene pCO₂ values into the high 300 to low 400 ppm range – very similar to the 11B pCO₂ estimates. This may indicate that the alkenone pCO₂ proxy agrees in magnitude with Plio-Pleistocene pCO₂ changes and thus may be sensitive at higher CO₂ levels but not at the very low Pleistocene glacial levels. The authors suggest this might be the case in the conclusions. If they show it is the case with their Pliocene reconstructions it would provide some nice empirical support (and they should mention this in the abstract).

Page 4 line 15 – how were alkenone 13C isotope measurements calibrated and what was the replicate precision and the accuracy (i.e. uncertainty from analysis plus uncertainty in realizing the VPDB scale). (Same comment for p5 line 6).

Page 9 line 20 – The previous paragraph stated that there is some evidence for a reduction in productivity during glacials and if that translates to cell-specific growth rates then it could explain some of the lack of signal in the alkenone pCO₂ reconstructions. In light of that observation, the following statement is confusing to me: “This suggests that either our understanding of growth rate effects on CO₂(ϵ_p -alk) is incorrect, or the estimation of cell size using preserved liths does not capture original cell size

C2

variations. . .” Doesn’t the prior statement suggest that our understanding of growth rate effects may actually be correct?

Page 10 line 25 – This paragraph is quite instructive, nice! One question is how the SST posterior is calculated? For the Pliocene, the SST would also affect the pCO₂ estimated by the 11B method. Thus, if one assumes a pCO₂ from the 11B and then gets a posterior SST from the alkenone proxy, this different SST would change the 11B pCO₂ estimate and thus the alkenone SST posterior based upon the earlier 11B CO₂ value is no longer correct.

Page 11 line 5 – “. . .the current understanding of the CO₂(ep-alk) proxy is wanting.” Yes, the b term may not in fact capture the scaling of physiological parameters or the truly important parameters.

Page 11 line 19 – The sentence starting, “Additionally, CO₂ optima. . .” is a bit unclear. I think the authors are saying that different species have different CO₂ optima so that CCM effects may vary between regions where different species dominate? But maybe not that. Please rewrite and clarify.

Very nice, concise explication of the issues and a nice manuscript!

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-152>, 2018.