

## Response to Reviewer 1

### Review #1

**de la Vega et al:** A  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$ -pH calibration for the high-latitude foraminifera species *Neogloboquadrina pachyderma* and *Neogloboquadrina incompta*.

This study establishes a  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$ -pH calibration for two key high-latitude planktonic foraminifera species *N. pachyderma* and *N. incompta*. These species are critical for reconstructing past ocean pH and atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  levels in Arctic and subpolar regions, where existing records are sparse. By using live-towed specimens collected from the North Atlantic, and pairing them with in situ hydrographic measurements, the authors avoid common assumptions required in core-top approaches and find:

1. *Neogloboquadrina*  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  values are lower than seawater  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  borate values. An interesting finding that is explained by localized acidification from respiration
2. The  $\delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{foram}}$  to  $\delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{borate}}$  slope is greater than 1, a notable deviation from other non-spinose species calibrations. Authors suggest that vital effects may be enhancing pH sensitivity in these species.
3. This calibration is applied to core-top samples from the Nordic Seas, demonstrating its paleoclimatic utility.

The motivation for the paper is sound and it is well-written. More studies like this are needed that explore the reasons why taxa can fall below the  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  borate line and presumably are calcifying under pH conditions lower than ambient seawater. This work has implications for understanding boron isotope incorporation in other taxa with notably low  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  (e.g. forams like *H. elegans* and bivalves). I would recommend the paper for publication following only minor edits. *We thank Reviewer #1 for their positive review of our manuscript.*

### **Line by line points to consider:**

Line 43: Cite Rae et al., 2018 Nature too here. A boron isotope paper that demonstrates the importance of carbon cycling and climate in the Southern Ocean. *We will add this reference in the revised manuscript.*

Line 64: Degrees Celsius doesn't really need to be spelled out. Simply "°C" is unambiguous and widely understood. *We will amend this as suggested in the revised manuscript.*

Line 108: This paragraph implies that only tow data are used when also core top data appear in the methods. Signpost the reader here to say that the calibration in this study is only composed of the tow data (for the reasons mentioned), and it is compared to core top data to demonstrate paleoclimatic utility. *We mention the use of coretops in the next paragraph line 125 "In order to assess the validity of the calibration we construct, we then apply the tow-based calibration to a series of high latitude core tops alongside existing data from the literature to evaluate its application to the paleorecord". We propose to move this sentence up to line 116 and thereby address the reviewer's comment.*

Line 253: 0.5M  $\text{HNO}_3$  should be 0.5 M  $\text{HNO}_3$  with a subscript. Check there is a space after M in other places where it is used in the text. *We will amend this and check for consistency throughout in the revised manuscript.*

Line 258: both Ca isotopes were measured, but presumably only 1 was used for calculating ratios? *Each element ratios were calculated with  $^{43}\text{Ca}$  and  $^{48}\text{Ca}$  and then averaged. We will clarify this point in the revised manuscript.*

Presumably Mg/Ca and Sr/Ca reproducibility are considerable better than 5%. We will clarify this in the revised manuscript and report the long-term reproducibility of the elemental ratios used in this study (e.g., Mg/Ca and Ba/Ca).

What [Ca] were samples run at? It says they were matrix matched, but to what concentration? 1mM? Ca concentrations ranged between 0.2 to 2 mM and were measured against a standard of the same concentration. To clarify we suggest rephrasing the sentence about Ca drift in lines 259-260 as follow: *"For samples bellow 1 mM, Element/Ca ratios typically drift, to account for this the concentration of the samples and standards were matched to account for this effect"*.

Line 262: Stewart et al, 2020 Geostand Geoanal Res demonstrates the reproducibility of the Southampton method relative to other labs. This is important as the trace metal data in this study are from Southampton *and* AWI. It is important to demonstrate that consistent standard values were being hit by both labs so that the data can be compared directly without any interlab offset. We agree with the reviewer. In the revised manuscript we will report the long-term averages for Mg/Ca and Ba/Ca for NIST-C (reference standard) typically measured at Southampton (NOC) and show that they are consistent with values reported in Stewart et al. (2020). Similarly, we will report the long-term average for JCP-1 typically measured at AWI and compare these to the interlaboratory assessment published in Hawthorne et al (2013). In addition, we cite Stewart et al 2016 where JCP-1 values for Mg/Ca (measured at NOC) were reported. This comparison shows that both laboratories produce consistent values without any significant interlaboratory offsets. We will clarify these points in the revised manuscript and add Table 1 to the supplementary materials.

Table 1: Comparison of El/Ca standards measured at NOC and AWI

Standards	NIST-C		JCP-1 (uncleaned)		
	Stewart et al. 2020	NOC	Hawthorne et al. 2013	AWI	NOC (Stewart et al. 2016)
El/Ca					
Mg/Ca	4.11±0.20	4.20±0.04	4.20±0.065	4.05±0.13	4.14±0.08
Ba/Ca	5.92±0.16	5.71±0.03	7.47±0.66	7.00±0.48	n/a

Line 266. New paragraph. We will add a new paragraph as suggested in the revised manuscript.

Line 267. 1.1 permil is a large TPB correction. It would be useful to know which sample this applied to in the data table with a column stating the magnitude of TPB correction. The Y axis error bars are large in Figure 2. It might be worth reiterating what went into these propagated errors (i.e. it is more than analytical uncert). This is important are there are two particularly low  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$ foram values ( $\sim 11.5\text{‰}$ ) that it could be argued are driving the slope  $>1$  phenomenon. It would be good to show clearly that these are not samples that are badly impacted by TPB. This is an important point. The low boron concentration of some samples resulted in a relatively large blank proportion (5% of sample size) and  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  correction of +0.4 to +1.1 ‰. For this reason, we aimed to be conservative and propagated the  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  uncertainty of the TPB ( $\pm 2\text{‰}$ ) into the corrected sample  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$ , resulting in this large final uncertainty. These points are in the high  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  range of the calibration. The low  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  points are not TPB corrected and therefore give confidence in the final slope. Figure 1 and Table 2 below show that the calibration with and without the TPB-corrected samples both yield a slope  $>1$ . We propose to add the figure and table to the supplementary material and add a section following lines 368 where we outline that the TPB correction does not influence the slope  $>1$  phenomenon.




Figure 1. Left: tow calibration including TPB corrected samples. Right: Tow calibration without TPB-corrected samples.

Table 1. The slope and intercept for each case is indicated below, with a slope  $> 1$  in both.

	intercept	slope	mswd
Tows (all sample)	-11.09 (+/-5.91)	1.58(+/-0.38)	0.579
Tows (without TPB-corrected samples)	-15.23(+/-7.31)	1.84 (+/-0.47)	0.700

Line 270: repetition of class 100. We will amend this in the revised manuscript.

Line 280: Again, worth citing Stewart et al., 2020 here as these are bang on interlab consensus values for AE121 that was found to be  $19.63 \pm 0.17$  ‰. i.e. when measured it is quite a bit lower than the original Vogel value. We will cite Stewart et al. 2020 in the revised manuscript.

Also, I think you mean MINUS 20.2 ‰ for the AE120, right? For the JCp value Gutjahr et al., 2020 should also be cited here. Thank for you spotting this typo, we will amend this in the revised manuscript.

Line 312: As above. The use of JCp-1 here can be used to discount interlab offsets in Mg/Ca between labs. Was the JCp cleaned or unclean? How does this value 3.94 compare to Hathorne et al., 2013 and also the measurements made in Southampton? JCP-1 was not oxidatively cleaned at AWI. We will clarify this point in the revised manuscript. We will also revise the long-term average for Mg/Ca measured in JCP-1 (uncleaned, AWI) from 3.94 to  $4.05 \pm 0.13$  which is based on a more comprehensive dataset. We will then compare it to Hathorne et al (2013) and measurements made at NOC in Southampton (e.g., Stewart et al. 2016) in a supplementary Table (e.g., Table 1 above). This comparison will show that there are no significant interlaboratory offsets between AWI and NOC at Southampton for Mg/Ca.

Line 320: add these core location to the map figure with labels. We will add the core locations to the map in the revised manuscript

Line 325: GLODAP should be all capital letters. We will amend this in the revised manuscript

Line 327: modern pH/ $\delta^{11}\text{B}$ borate is ambiguous (also line 368 – please check for other instances of this e.g. line 532). I think you mean “or” here, but it could be construed as the ratio of pH to  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  borate. We will amend the sentence to “unlike comparing foraminiferal  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  core top values to modern pH and  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$ borate”.

Line 341:  $432.6 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$  needs a superscript. Otherwise it just means minus 1. We will amend this in the revised manuscript

Line 346: Does this monte carlo approach need a citation of Chalk et al., 2017? This method was used by several boron studies including Martinez-Boti et al. (2015) and Chalk et al. (2017), this detail will be added to the revised manuscript.

Line 355: ok to group them for now, but it will be fascinating to see if *N. pachyderma* and *N. incompta* need to be separated for calibration purposes once more  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  data are generated across a wide pH range for each taxon. The differences in Ba/Ca noted later in the text are intriguing and suggests they are living very different lives. I look forward to the next study on this!! Yes, we agree.

Line 388. I think this section 3.3 is what is needed in the intro to signpost the reader about what is to come before they see the methods. We have addressed this point above.

Line 410: Could even bring coral data in here for comparison to show that this slope  $>1$  is really unusual. You already use the *Balanophyllia* Gagnon 2021 citation elsewhere. Could also mention *D. dianthus* from Anagnostou 2012 and McCulloch et al., 2012. We will add the suggested references in the revised manuscript

Line 423: again “ $\delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{foram}} - \delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{borate}}$ ” is an ambiguous dash that could be a minus sign We will amend this (revise into a dash) in the revised manuscript

Line 456: Unsure what "privileged" is supposed to imply here. I'm not sure it is needed. We will delete the word “*privileged*” in the revised manuscript

Line 471: CO<sub>3</sub>-2 should be “2-” not to the power of minus 2. We will amend this mistake in the revised manuscript

Line 481: use words as part of a sentence rather than >> here. We will amend this sentence to: “*even if the pH internally is significantly greater than the micro-environment*”, in the revised manuscript.

Line 520: pH written twice We will delete the repition in the revised manuscript

Line 565: space between units “50 m” and “150 m”. There are many other instances of this in the text. Please check. We will add the space as suggested and check for consistency throughout the revised manuscript.

Line 566: *d<sup>11</sup>B<sub>borate</sub>* is now italic. Be consistent for clarity. We ensure consistency throughout the revised manuscript.

Line 601: “is” shouldn’t be italic We will correct the font in the revised manuscript

Line 672 “extent” We will amend this in the revised manuscript

Table 1: add the tpb correction magnitude to this table. Also check the number of significant figures on the Ba/Ca column. We will add the TPB correction to this table in the revised manuscript.

Table 2: define mswd. We will add “mean square weighted deviation” to this sentence in the revised manuscript

Figure 1: Caption says pCO<sub>2</sub>, but this is delta pCO<sub>2</sub> relative to the atmosphere. This should be clearly explained in the caption. The figures could be better integrated with one another for instance plankton

tows are red dots in Fig1 and therefore should be red dots in the data figure 2. Try to keep colours and symbols consistent to guide the reader's eye of what is incompta and pachyderma and what is a tow or a core top. Use larger symbols for "this study" if you need to draw attention to what is new. **We will streamline and amend this figure in the revised manuscript**

Figure 2: axis labels are ambiguous. The use of a dash (–) in “Foraminifera (tow) –  $\delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{foram}}$  (‰)” implies this is some value of foraminifera minus the  $\delta^{11}\text{B}$  of calcite (same goes for the x axis). Y axis should read “ $\delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{foram}}$  (tow) [‰]” and x axis should read “Seawater  $\delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{borate}}$  [‰]”. **We will clarify the axis label in the revised manuscript.**

Figure 3: more detail needed in the caption. **We will add more detail in the figure caption and explain that it is a model.**

Figure 4: again check for ambiguous minus signs. Do you actually mean minus in this case of  $\delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{foram}} - \delta^{11}\text{B}_{\text{borate}}$ ? It is not clear which taxa are plotted in panel b. the caption says pachyderma, but the extremely high Ba/Ca values suggest incompta are also on there. As per my earlier comment – figures need to be better integrated with the same colours and or symbols for tows and species where possible to guide the reader's eye. **We will clarify the axis label and colours used for this figure in the revised manuscript.**

Figure 5: as above. Axis labels need revision for clarity. Caption needs to explain again  $\text{PI}$  and  $\text{C}_{\text{ANT}}$  so that the reader doesn't need to search the main text. **We will add “*PI stands for preindustrial and  $\text{C}_{\text{ANT}}$  for anthropogenic carbon correction.*” in the figure caption in the revised manuscript.**

Figure 6: y axis should read “...concentration [ppm]”.  $\text{d}^{18}\text{O}_{\text{c}}$  should be  $\delta^{18}\text{O}_{\text{c}}$ . N pachyderma should be italic. Explain “CIAAN” Station. Again this could be better integrated with the map figure. e.g. Station 16 is mentioned often in the text but not highlighted on the map. **We will amend the y-axis as suggested and clarify the figure caption in the revised manuscript. We feel that station IDs on the map would lead to overcrowding. Detailed locations (Lat/Long) for each station are listed in Supplementary Table S1.**