

A 23 m.y. record of low atmospheric CO₂

Brian A. Schubert¹, Ying Cui², A. Hope Jahren³

¹School of Geosciences, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Lafayette, Louisiana 70504, USA

²Department of Earth and Environmental Studies, Montclair State University, Montclair, New Jersey 07043, USA

³Centre for Earth Evolution and Dynamics, University of Oslo, N-0315, Oslo, Norway

Within their Comment, Jardine and Lomax (2021) object to our reconstruction of low atmospheric CO₂ across the last 23 m.y. (Cui et al., 2020) by claiming to identify three fatal problems in our analysis: First, that the predictive relationship we employ between carbon isotope value and CO₂ (Schubert and Jahren, 2012, 2015, 2018) is negated by the study of Lomax et al. (2019); second, that the widely observed effect of water stress on carbon isotope discrimination ($\Delta^{13}\text{C}$) in land-plant derived carbon prohibits the use of $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ to infer CO₂; third, that our method for CO₂ reconstruction acts to systematically underpredict CO₂. Below we address all three points.

To address the first point: to perform CO₂ reconstruction, we rely on plant growth experiments (Schubert and Jahren, 2012) that showed $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ value increasing with CO₂ according to a hyperbolic response described as the following:

$$\Delta^{13}\text{C} = [(A)(B)(\text{CO}_2 + C)] / [(A) + (B)(\text{CO}_2 + C)], \quad (1)$$

where A is the asymptote, B is a measure of responsiveness, and C offsets the y-intercept to 4.4‰ (Schubert and Jahren, 2012). Figure 1 and Table 1 show that the data produced by Lomax et al. (2019) actually confirm our original work, although this has not been recognized by the authors: all treatments performed are well-described by the hyperbolic relationship we apply (Fig. 1A), producing highly comparable values of A, B and C (Table 1).




Figure 1. The effect of CO₂ on $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ value. (A) $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ values from Lomax et al. (2019) and Cui et al. (2020) follow a hyperbolic relationship with increasing CO₂ (Equation 1), as previously described (Schubert and Jahren, 2012, 2015) and used within Cui et al. (2020). Curve fitting parameters excluding the outlier measured at 1500 ppm (10 ml/day) are listed in Table 1. (B) First derivative, or slope, of the hyperbolic relationships (S, Equation 2) is functionally identical for all treatments.

Table 1. Comparison of curve fitting parameters A, B, and C (Equation 1) and calculated S values (Equation 2) using experiments of Lomax et al. (2019) compared with Cui et al. (2020).

	A	B	C	r	S(‰/100 ppm)					
					380	760	1000	1500	2000	3000
Lomax et al. (2019): 10 ml/day	26.9	0.17	31.0	0.84	1.3	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.04
Lomax et al. (2019): 20 ml/day	28.5	0.17	30.5	0.82	1.4	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.05
Lomax et al. (2019): Saturated	28.3	0.17	30.6	0.90	1.4	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.05
Cui et al. (2020)	28.3	0.22	23.9	0.88	1.3	0.4	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.04

As for the second point: the most extreme water stress treatment (10 ml/day) within Lomax et al. (2019) yielded a value of A that was lowered by 1.4‰ compared to the A value resulting from our myriad experiments used within Cui et al. (2020), while the A value for all other treatments (including 20 ml/day) within Lomax et al. (2019) match our value of A to within 0.2‰ (Table 1). Lower values for A under water stress are fully consistent with our expectations (Schubert and Jahren, 2018), again confirming our earlier work. More importantly, S, the key value that we use to reconstruct CO₂ (defined as the change in $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ value per change in CO₂ and is calculated as the first derivative of Equation 1):

$$S = (A^2)(B)/[A+(B)(\text{CO}_2 + C)]^2, \quad (2)$$

is unaffected by the range of A values produced by all treatments within Lomax et al. (2019), including that of the most extreme water-stress

treatment (Fig. 1B and Table 1). We illustrate this by reconstructing CO₂ using our proxy with A, B, and C determined from the data set of Lomax et al. (2019) and compare it with CO₂ reconstructed within our original paper (Fig. 2). We find that the average difference between our original reconstruction and that determined using the 10 ml/day, 20 ml/day and saturated experiments of Lomax et al. (2019) is 1.0 ppm, 3.0 ppm and 2.7 ppm, respectively (Fig. 2), thus reinforcing our previous conclusion that the effect of CO₂ on $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ value is independent of water availability (Schubert and Jahren, 2018) and the choice of A has only a very small effect on reconstructed CO₂ (Cui and Schubert, 2016).




Figure 2. CO₂ calculated using our proxy with the experimental data of Lomax et al. (2019) compared to that of Cui et al. (2020). The average difference between our values and those produced using Lomax et al. (2019) = 2.2 ppm.

Third, the claim that our approach acts to systematically underpredict CO₂ is directly contradicted by a test that we performed years ago (i.e., Schubert and Jahren, 2015), wherein we compared the CO₂ record predicted by our method to CO₂ levels observed over the last 30,000 years via ice cores. The result was a CO₂ record that closely matched the ice cores ($r^2 = 0.95$), and was not affected by calculating CO₂ based on changes in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value (i.e., $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{anomaly}}$; Cui et al. 2020) or changes in $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ value (i.e., $\Delta(\Delta^{13}\text{C})$; Schubert and Jahren, 2015) (average difference = 0.2 ppm). Moreover, the uncertainty analysis used in Cui and Schubert (2016) is very conservative: the 95% confidence interval allows for a 6.4‰ range in $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ value, which is comparable to the range of plant-tissue $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ values spanning xeric to rainforest ecosystems, and is ~5× larger than the range of plant-tissue $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ values measured within the water treatment experiments of Lomax et al. (2019).

In summary, we stand by our original analyses and results with no reservations. We have deposited all associated data, with the 95% confidence intervals, in the paleo-CO₂.org database.

REFERENCES CITED

- Cui, Y., and Schubert, B.A., 2016, Quantifying uncertainty of past $p\text{CO}_2$ determined from changes in C₃ plant carbon isotope fractionation: *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, v. 172, p. 127–138, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2015.09.032>.
- Cui, Y., Schubert, B.A., and Jahren, A.H., 2020, A 23 m.y. record of low atmospheric CO₂: *Geology*, v. 48, p. 888–892, <https://doi.org/10.1130/G47681.1>.
- Jardine, P.E., and Lomax, B.H., 2021, A 23 m.y. record of low atmospheric CO₂: Comment: *Geology*, v. 49, p. e523, <https://doi.org/10.1130/G48596C.1>.
- Lomax, B.H., Lake, J.A., Leng, M.J., and Jardine, P.E., 2019, An experimental evaluation of the use of $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$ as a proxy for palaeoatmospheric CO₂: *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, v. 247, p. 162–174, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2018.12.026>.
- Schubert, B.A., and Jahren, A.H., 2012, The effect of atmospheric CO₂ concentration on carbon isotope fractionation in C₃ land plants: *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, v. 96, p. 29–43, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2012.08.003>.
- Schubert, B.A., and Jahren, A.H., 2015, Global increase in plant carbon isotope fractionation following the Last Glacial Maximum caused by increase in atmospheric $p\text{CO}_2$: *Geology*, v. 43, p. 435–438, <https://doi.org/10.1130/G36467.1>.
- Schubert, B.A., and Jahren, A.H., 2018, Incorporating the effects of photorespiration into terrestrial paleoclimate reconstruction: *Earth-Science Reviews*, v. 177, p. 637–642, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.earscirev.2017.12.008>.