

Biogeosciences Discuss., referee comment RC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2021-177-RC1>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



## Comment on bg-2021-177

Anonymous Referee #1

---

Referee comment on "Biomarker characterization of the North Water Polynya, Baffin Bay: Implications for local sea ice and temperature proxies" by David J. Harning et al., Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2021-177-RC1>, 2021

---

Review '*Biomarker characterization of the North Water Polynya, Baffin Bay: Implications for local sea ice and temperature proxies*'

David Harning and colleagues present new biomarker data from 13 surface sediment samples in northern and western Baffin Bay, focusing on the region of the North Water Polynya. Biomarker data comprise HBIs, sterols, alkenones, and GDGTs, representing a comprehensive study of the use of biomarker-based sea-ice and temperature proxies in Baffin Bay and for the characterization of polynya dynamics. They conclude that the pelagic and sympagic productivity is an order of magnitude higher at the polynya sites, compared to sites outside of the NOW region. This translates to low (higher) PIP<sub>25</sub> indices within (outside) of the NOW, in line with satellite-derived sea-ice concentration. Harding et al. recommend using sterols rather than HBI III to calculate PIP<sub>25</sub> indices in the Baffin Bay region, due to uncertainty with regard to HBI III producing species. Further, they propose regional temperature calibrations for both alkenone and GDGT indices, but also show that other environmental variables might contribute to the variability in alkenone and GDGT assemblage recorded in sediments.

The manuscript is very well written and follows a clear storyline with a logical succession of scientific arguments. The presented data fits within the remit of *Biogeosciences* and I only have a few minor comments regarding comparison with previously published data, and correlations of the environmental and biomarker data. Thus, I recommend publication in *Biogeosciences* following minor revisions.

General comments:

- Please comment on why the concentrations of HBIs in the Baffin Bay surface sediments (in part from the same samples) vary by orders of magnitude between the data presented here and the data presented in Kolling et al. 2020.
- The Baffin Bay data presented in Kolling et al. 2020 do not show lower P<sub>B</sub>IP<sub>25</sub> and P<sub>D</sub>IP<sub>25</sub> indices in the NOW region. Please comment on this in the manuscript. Is it possible to integrate your data with previously published data to strengthen/confirm the

arguments made?

- For the data presented in Figure 6 and 9:
  - Why are alkenone indices not compared to autumn conditions?
  - What is the significance level for the presented  $R^2$  values? Can you include confidence intervals?
  - I also wonder how the uncertainty of the WOA18 data for each given depth interval and station influences the significance of  $R^2$ . However, I am unsure of the best way to test this, maybe you could consider determination of  $R^2$  confidence intervals using bootstrapping where the environmental data (e.g. temperature) is based on random sampling of normal distributions characterised by the mean and standard deviation of the data for a given depth interval and station.
  - Considering the fragmentary availability of winter and spring WOA18 data, do the data summed up in the annual datasets (Fig. 6 and Fig. 9) cover the same interval for each year or is it an average of all data available for a given year? If the latter, does it make a difference if the data is restricted to the same seasons for every year?
- Line 459-460: This is a somewhat circular argument, as the temperature calibration is based on correlation with the WOA18 data.

Visual presentation:

- In Figure 1, could you highlight the samples from where bulk geochemical proxies are available (e.g. differing fill/line colour)?
- Figures S1-S3: Please add the same style of overview maps for  $C_{37:2}$ ,  $C_{37:3}$ , and  $C_{37:4}$  to the supplementary information, so the reader can see which samples had alkenone concentrations over the limit of detection.

Typographic comments:

- Line 25: Remove *bvc* from Kuhlbrodt et al., 2017
- Check spelling of sea ice vs. sea-ice for consistency. The dominantly used spelling is sea ice, but sea-ice is used in 4 instances (line 45, 63, 98, 436).
- Lines 73-74: 'In contrast, the NOW has anomalously low concentrations of thin ice, even during winter months.' Maybe rephrase this sentence for clarity (anomalously low concentrations of thin ice can also be read as meaning thick sea ice).
- Line 204: There is a full stop missing after '...for 20 min.)'
- Lines 501-502: check nitrate vs. nitrite
- Revise formatting of the reference list, to comply with the style of *Biogeosciences*.