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Reaction to C2676–C2678 S. Voigt (Referee)

S. Voigt (Referee):” (1) The main result of this study rests on the discrimination of the magnitude of carbon isotopic fractionation between a global component that represents enhanced rates of organic carbon burial and a regional productivity-related component. The contribution of organic carbon burial is estimated to have been 2.5 ‰ based on inorganic carbon $\delta^{13}$C-records. Although this value is widely accepted in the scientific community, it is founded on analyses of chalk and limestone which all experienced a certain degree of burial diagenesis. Here, I want to make aware that the only pristine
inorganic OAE-2 $\delta^{13}C$ -record we know to date has a magnitude of 4 ‰ (Voigt et al., 2004). This higher magnitude is identical with values derived from terrestrial organic matter that reflect changes in the isotopic composition of the atmosphere and therefore the global component of the OAE-2 excursion (Barclay et al., 2010). A higher magnitude of the global OAE-2 excursion would have significant influence on the calculation provided in this study.”

We appreciate this comment. Indeed, 2.5 ‰ is the generally accepted positive isotope excursion during OAE-2 based on many carbonate records although one could wonder how diagenesis has affected this assessment. However, the record published by Voigt et al. (2004; Figure 2) shows quite some scatter and when a running mean is taken a clear 2.5 ‰ excursion is evident. Therefore, we feel we should stick to the generally accepted 2.5 ‰. We followed the suggestion of the referee and redid our calculations using the 4 ‰ excursion. During OAE-2 this leads to an approximately 1500 ppm larger increase in pCO$_2$ values. Although the [CO$_2$(aq)] values change for the three different scenarios, the conclusion about the changes in productivity among the four sites remain the same. We feel that it would make the manuscript unnecessarily long when adding these calculations.

S. Voigt (Referee):” (2) The temporal relationship between atmospheric CO$_2$ reduction and surface water cooling as feedback of CO$_2$ sequestration is not as well constrained as the authors have stated it. This becomes especially evident from the data presented for Site 1260 in Figure 6 (We assume the referee meant Figure 7 or 8). The initial CO$_2$ rise occurred in pre-OAE-2 times while the rise in SST that should be associated, is related to the initial phase of OAE-2. A similar temporal offset is evident for the proposed relation between declining atmospheric CO$_2$ values and SST. While the CO$_2$ reduction is related to the initial OAE-2, the SST cooling is significantly delayed. According to the available astronomical age models of OAE-2 (Sageman et al., 2006; Voigt et al., 2008) these temporal offsets are in the order of 10s to 100 kyr. Such long time spans are not consistent with the response time of the ocean-climate system today and are also not
supported by results OAE-2 ocean-climate modeling (Flögel et al., 2011).”

We agree that currently the direct link between pCO$_2$ and temperature during OAE-2 still needs to be better developed. In our view this is predominantly because we lack accurate proxies for pCO$_2$ and because we are comparing local temperature records (i.e. SST) that are definitely affected by additional factors than the atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration with global CO$_2$ (reconstructed) signals. Nevertheless we feel that there are clear indications that higher CO$_2$ levels are inducing higher SSTs (e.g. during volcanic outgassing) and that lower CO$_2$ levels (due to burial of OM) results in lower SSTs. We will carefully rephrase this section, accommodating the concerns of the referee.

S. Voigt (Referee):” (3) Another question that arises from the proposed relation between productivity, organic carbon burial and atmospheric CO$_2$ reduction is, why is the cold event such a brief pulse, while high organic carbon burial rates and low atmospheric CO$_2$ concentrations persisted through the entire OAE-2 interval? Are there additional mechanisms involved?”

Our pCO$_2$ record does not cover the stratigraphic interval following directly to the cold event at Site 1260, thus, it is not evident from our data that pCO$_2$ indeed stayed low throughout most of phase B. Work by Jarvis et al. (2011) reveals that reconstructed pCO$_2$ values re-increase just after a minimum that roughly coincides with the paleotemperature minimum. Furthermore, the atmospheric CO$_2$ concentration is not only affected by burial of OM and enhanced weathering during OAE-2 but also by substantially increased volcanic activity, releasing CO$_2$ to the atmosphere. So, although we observe an episode of cooling during OAE-2, this is counterbalanced by an increase in volcanic activity (see Turgeon and Creaser, 2008; van Bentum et al., 2009; Snow et al., 2005). We already mention this on page 6207, line 6 onwards, but will elaborate a little bit more at this point.

S. Voigt (Referee):” (4) Site 1260 is the most condensed OAE-2 succession among
all sites along the Demerara Rise transect (Hardas and Mutterlose, 2006; Erbacher et al., 2005). The probability that the OAE-2 interval is completely recorded, as stated in paper, is rather low.”

We are aware of the fact that the OAE-2 interval at Site 1260 appears rather condensed when compared to the OAE-intervals that were recovered from neighboring sites along the Demerara transect. However, since both the $\delta^{13}C$ phytane and the $\delta^{13}C$ bulk isotope record reveal all the important features which are characteristic for the event elsewhere (Forster et al., 2007), we are not worried that the record at Site 1260 is incomplete. In fact, it is not really of importance for our calculations of the three scenarios. For the scenarios we only use the largest amplitude of the excursion, it would therefore only influence our calculations if the excursion at Demerara Rise Site 1260 was even larger than it already is. However, this seems rather unlikely.

S. Voigt (Referee):” Figure 4: The latitudinal $\delta^{13}C$ gradient of recent organic matter (Rau et al., 1982) appears as a straight line. What is the data base for it? Does it reflect data from two single sites or represent it the linear regression of results from many sites? The different length of arrows needs to be explained in the figure caption.”

The slope of the line taken from the Rau paper (1982) is the linear regression from many measurements of surface water plankton $\delta^{13}C$. The arrows were mainly used for illustration, the dark grey arrows indicates the 2.5‰ of the OAE-2 excursion that has been interpreted as the result of enhanced global OM burial, the light grey arrow represents the amount of the excursion that is due to local variations. We will add this to the figure caption.

Page 6194, line 15 – Will be changed to: “the carbon isotope record used by Barclay et al. (2010) ”

Page 6196, line 5 – Change sandy limestones to: foraminiferal packstones (Nederbragt et al., 2007).
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