Clim. Past Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/cp-2016-119-SC1, 2017
© Author(s) 2017. CC-BY 3.0 License.

Climate of the Past
Discussions

Interactive comment on "A 21,000 year record of organic matter quality in the WAIS Divide ice core" *by* Juliana D'Andrilli et al.

A. Baker

a.baker@unsw.edu.au

Received and published: 20 January 2017

It is really interesting to see a record of organic matter fluorescence from an ice core. Organic matter fluorescence is in my expertise area, so I have provided these comments on the manuscript, focusing only on the optical analyses. I hope they are of use. I also recommend Coble PG et al 2014 Aquatic Organic Matter Fluorescence (Cambridge University Press) (Disclaimer – I am a co-editor and co-author of two chapters, but these chapters are not those I recommend here).

Line 88. When I have investigated the use of 'septa sealed vials', I find a contaminant fluorescent signal coming from the septa, which in my tests has always been fluorescent. Can the authors confirm that their septa sealed amber glass vials produced zero fluorescence blanks?

Line 89-90. Following on from my previous comment, were the blanks run just on the melting system, or the melting system and amber glass vials? It is not clear at present.

Line 97. What was the actual absorbance values? These should be plotted as a time series, as A254 is used as a surrogate for DOC in terrestrial systems. It would be interesting for the reader to see this data and for the authors to compare values to other terrestrial systems (e.g. rivers, groundwaters).

Line 106-107. Were the data also processed to remove Rayleigh-Tyndall scatter? How were the Raman and Rayleigh-Tyndall scatter lines processed? Were they replaced by zeros, by NaN (not a number) or was data interpolated? All of these effects can have subtle influence on the resultant PARAFAC model, so it is good to report them.

Lines 108-110. The authors must specify what they did for sample classification, normalisation and subset selection. It will be different from Cawley et al (2012), which is just one fluorescence case study, and on pulp mills, so not really very relevant to this research.

Lines 108-110. Somewhere in this section the authors must quote the value of the standard(s) that they were using. This could be the Raman intensity of Milli-Q water at a specific wavelength, or the intensity of quinine sulphate standards run using the same instrument configuration, or an International Humic Substances Standard, or a tryptophan or tyrosine standard.

Lines 110-111. More detail is needed on the PARAFAC model, to allow the reader to assess its strength in modelling the data. It is crucial in this paper, as the PARAFAC model is the crux of the whole analysis and interpretation. 1. One would expect to see the core consistency value given. A 'passable' model could be considered have a value of >90%, and a good model a score of >99%. 2. It would be very informative to know why the authors chose a 3 component model over a 2 or 4 component model – did the 4 component model try to model noise, for example? Or did it model a plausible 4th component, but with a low core consistency. 3. The percentage of the data fitted

by each component is very valuable information, especially if compared with that from a two and four component model. 4. And finally, a split-half analysis is very useful, especially if the authors perform a split half analysis using randomly split datasets and a split half analysis with LGM data in one dataset and Holocene data in the other. If the split half analysis fails on the latter test, then it tells you that the LGM and Holocene need different PARAFAC models.

Line 126-127. Amino-acid like fluorescence is too general. Only tryptophan and tyrosine have aromatic groups which fluoresce, and even then, without independent amino acid analyses to confirm their presence, one can never be sure that these compounds are responsible for the fluorescence. If the fluorescence is from an amino acids source, then C1 and C2 look most like a 'tryrosine-like' compound. Tyrosine would excite at both ∼225 nm and ∼275 nm and emit at about 310 nm. But the molecular structure is such that you must observe both the 225 and 275 nm excitation of the 310 nm emission, not just one or the other, as you show in Figure 3. Supplemental Figure 1 confirms the absence of a ∼275 nm excitation peak. Therefore C1 and C2 are not 'tyrosine-like' or 'tryptophan-like'. Model compounds and contaminants that exhibit a single peak in this general region include simple phenols such as cresol (see Aiken, 2014 in Coble et al. (eds) Aquatic Organic Matter Fluorescence), PAHs such as fluorene (Ferretto et al 2014, DOI:10.1016/j.chemosphere.2013.12.087) and aviation fuel (see Baker et al. 2014, Encyc. Anal. Chem. DOI: 10.1002/9780470027318.a9412).

Line 128. The reference to 'recalcitrant species' is speculative. It would be better to specify the excitation and emission wavelengths of this peak or peaks. I am not aware of fluorescence in this region being recalcitrant – instead bio- and photo- degradation studies show that it is degradable (for example, Osburn et al and Stedmon and Cory, both in Coble et al 2014).

Line 129 and Figure 2. There is almost no meaning in 'total OM fluorescence intensities'. Each fluorophore has a different fluorescence efficiency. For example, in this study, you identify three fluorescent components, but each will have a different amount

of emitted fluorescence per g C present. So, summing the three is meaningless. It is particularly relevant as low molecular weight compounds such as tryptophan-like and tyrosine-like compounds (argued to be C1 and C2 here) have less chance of their emitted fluorescence being reabsorbed within the molecule, and they therefore have relatively high fluorescence efficiency. In contract, fulvic-like compounds (arguably C3 here) can reabsorb their emitted fluorescence, resulting in a much lower fluorescence efficiency. Figure 2 is therefore just meaningless and instead each PARAFAC component score (C1, C2, C3) needs to be presented.

Line 134 and Figure 3. The PARAFAC scores for C1, C2 and C3 need to be presented in Figure 3. At the moment, no raw data from the PARAFAC model is presented in the paper, yet this is the main focus. The reader has no way of seeing the data and judging its nature e.g. variability over time. Just drawing some PARAFAC model EEMs over an x-y plot would be unacceptable to the fluorescent organic matter research community.

Line 134-136. This observation needs quantification (see comment above).

Line 137-139. As in my earlier comment, you cannot have just one of the two excitation peaks that 'tyrosine-like' compounds excite at, and then call it 'tyrosine-like'.

Line 139-145. There is most fluorescence at 310 nm, so this is not 'tryptophan-like' at all, as this would also have a peak at 350 nm. More fundamentally, there is a line through the EEM at 310nm which cannot be real. Is this an artefact of the design process of Figure 2, or is it in the actual PARAFAC model? If the latter, it means the model is not correctly modelling the data. Is there anything instrumental e.g. physical filters that change over at 310 nm that could be the cause of this artefact? Is it still present in the 2 component model?

Line 142. If you performed a single PARAFAC model, then the location of the modelled fluorescence can't change over time. So how can the location of the peak 'move' from LGM to Holocene? Is this from extra PARAFAC analyses that the reader doesn't know about? Or is it a subjective analysis of the original EEMs?

Line 145-150. I would disagree with this interpretation. This fluorescence is typical of 'peak A' and 'peak C' compounds. A peak 'M' fluorescence would be blue shifted compared to 'peak A', and in your component C3 there are two peaks and they both have the same emission wavelengths.

Lines 153-155. The fact that no one else has reported your fluorescence peaks is either very exciting or very worrying. It would suggest that what you are seeing is not anything that has been reported before e.g. you are not seeing 'tyrosine-like' fluorescence, and by implication, you can't definitively interpret it as a microbial signal.

Line 160 and Figure 4. The authors state that Figure 4 shows the 'PARAFAC components', but there is just one line. What is this? Is it C1, or C2, or C3? All three components must be shown individually, here and in Figure 3.

Line 175. C1 and C2 PARAFAC model scores need to be plotted in Figure 3.

Line 177. From Figure 3, component C2 is not 'tryptophan-like'.

Line 184. C3 PARAFAC model scores need to be plotted in Figure 3.

Line 188. There is no evidence in the contemporary literature that fluorescence in this region is recalcitrant.

Line 189-191. This observation is unremarkable, as all humic and fulvic substances standards have a higher fluorescence intensity at the short excitation wavelength (see examples in Aiken (2014)).

Line 191. It sounds like you are saying that there are plants and soil in the ice? I'm sure you don't mean that?

Line 191. The C3 data needs to be presented in Figure 3.

Line 214. No fluorescence data over time is presented (except for the total fluorescence, which is not meaningful). So this section is speculative.

Andy Baker Sydney, Australia

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., doi:10.5194/cp-2016-119, 2016.