

1 **MANUSCRIPT NUMBER: Biogeosciences Discussions 11, 13343-13387, 2014**

2 **TITLE: Systematics of past changes in ocean ventilation: a comparison of**  
3 **Cretaceous Ocean Anoxic Event 2 and Pleistocene to Holocene Oxygen**  
4 **Minimum Zones**

5 **- Explanation of revisions -**

6 Referee #1 (Holger Gebhardt)

7 Referee 1 noted that the title reflects only partly the contents of the paper

8 **reply:** indeed, we did not describe changes in past ocean ventilation but compared  
9 records of the late Quaternary Peruvian OMZ and the Cenomanian /Turonian Tarfaya  
10 Basin. We changed the title to: “Records of past mid-depth ventilation: Cretaceous  
11 Ocean Anoxic Event 2 vs. Pleistocene to Holocene Oxygen Minimum Zones“. The new  
12 title is shorter by four words, and we hope it is now more to the point.

13 1. The referee found abstract too long and recommended it to be shortened.

14 **reply:** we shortened the Abstract from 416 to 388 words in the revised version of the  
15 manuscript.

16 2. Holger Gebhardt asked why the authors did not compare Cretaceous and Quaternary  
17 benthic foraminiferal assemblages as they have been considered by many authors to be  
18 excellent oxygenation indicators. He asked to explain why foraminiferal assemblages  
19 were not considered for the evaluation of past ocean ventilation.

20 **reply:** benthic foraminiferal assemblages exhibited different community structures in  
21 Jurassic and Early Cretaceous low oxygen assemblages, which were characterized by  
22 low population densities and a dominance of textulariids and lagenids. Modern  
23 buliminid-boliviniid dominated benthic foraminiferal OMZ assemblages with a typical  
24 productivity driven distribution pattern became fully established during the  
25 Santonian/Campanian OAE3 (Holbourn and Kuhnt, 1998). Critical turning points in  
26 benthic foraminiferal evolution were the Cretaceous OAEs 1 and 2 (Aptian and  
27 Cenomanian/Turonian), when rotaliids began to dominate the assemblages in low  
28 oxygen environments. These changes may have been related to changes in benthic -  
29 pelagic coupling, when diatom-derived phytodetritus became an important source of  
30 food for benthic foraminifers in the deep sea. Although morphotypes may be similar in

- 1 Pleistocene and Cretaceous assemblages, the trophic structure of the faunas were most
- 2 likely different due to evolutionary changes.
- 3

1 3. The referee questioned that reservoir ages can be determined that exactly as stated, and he  
2 suggests to take 90 to 340 years throughout.

3 **reply:** The reservoir ages were calculated as regionally weighted mean values by using  
4 data entries from the Marine Reservoir Correction Database  
5 (<http://calib.qub.ac.uk/marine/>) for the eastern Pacific off Peru. The uncertainties of the  
6 source data range from  $\pm 31$  to  $\pm 82$  years (2-sigma). Therefore, it is not a mirror of  
7 analytical precision to round up 89 to 90 and 338 to 340 yrs. We are aware of the  
8 uncertainties of AMS radiocarbon measurements but keep the mean values because  
9 they were accurately calculated. This is now specified in the text of the revised version.

10 4. Referee 1 asked why we have used shallow infaunal *Uvigerina* species for stable  
11 isotope analyses and not epifaunal *Cibicidoides* species.

12 **reply:** *Cibicidoides* species were rare, *Uvigerina striata*, *U. peregrina* and *Globobulimina*  
13 *pacifica* were abundant throughout the sediment cores from the Peruvian OMZ. We agree  
14 that preference should be given to epibenthic foraminiferal species for isotope  
15 measurements mirroring bottom water conditions. Despite exceptions caused by  
16 bacterial mats (Hoogakker et al., 2010 and references therein), *Uvigerina* and  
17 *Globobulimina* species incorporate stable oxygen isotopes in equilibrium with the  
18 surrounding pore waters, which are same as in the supernatant bottom water (e.g.  
19 McCorkle et al., 1990). We specified this in the text of the revised version.

20 5. The referee recommended the paragraph between 13349, line 26 and 13350, line 4 to be  
21 shifted to the Introduction, and he asked the check again the appropriateness of Poulsen  
22 (1998) and Topper et al. (2011) references.

23 **reply:** the references were wrong. We inserted the correct citations in the revised  
24 version of the manuscript.

25 6. Referee 1 noted that Chapter 3.1 is not exclusively focusing on the Peruvian OMZ and  
26 suggests to change the title accordingly. Furthermore, the subchapter on laminations  
27 describes general concepts developed in many parts of the world. He suggests only those  
28 parts referring to the modern Peruvian or Cretaceous Moroccan shelf should be presented  
29 in the results section.

30 **reply:** the referee is right indeed. We therefore changed the title of subchapter 3.1 to  
31 “Holocene to Recent organic-rich sedimentation underneath Recent OMZs“. The  
32 separation of information gained from the Peruvian OMZ from data created in other

1 OMZs is not justified. Our paper is a review paper. Therefore, it has to address the  
2 subject comprehensively and it has to include all available information and resources,  
3 also from other places. This applies in particular to concepts that were developed off  
4 California or the Pakistan Margin.

5 7. Holger Gebhardt suggested to present a location map for all cores analysed including  
6 Peru and Morocco in order to underpin the dimension of this study.

7 **reply:** we included a location map with the studied sediment cores and wells as new  
8 Figure 1 in the revised version of the manuscript.

9 8. Referee 1 recommended the following technical corrections:

10 - the succession of cited papers within the text would not follow an obvious rule. They  
11 should be in an order according to the journal guidelines.

12 **reply:** according to the guidelines for authors, citations can be sorted either according to  
13 relevance, in chronological or alphabetical order. We decided to sort them in  
14 chronological order as we report the progress of knowledge in places. The citations were  
15 re-formatted in the revised version of the manuscript accordingly.

16 - page 13346, l. 12: Expedition in 1965 revealed. . . in order to distinguish the phrase from a  
17 reference.

18 **reply:** - done -

19 - page 13351, l. 1: Kuhnt et al. 2001 is missing in the ref.-list.

20 **reply:** - done -

21 - page 13351, l. 6ff.: Correct spelling is Savrda (see also ref.-  
22 list).

23 **reply:** - done -

24 - page 13354, l. 13: Gutierrez et al. 2006 as in ref.-list?

25 **reply:** - done -

26 - page 13356, l. 11: bioturbated

27 **reply:** - done -

28 - page 13357, l. 18: Gebhardt et al. 2004.

29 **reply:** - done -

1 - page 13358, l. 18: Kemp et al. 1990 or Kemp 1996?

2 **reply:** Kemp (1990) is correct.

3 - page 13361, l. 13: Martin et al. 1987 is missing in ref.-list.

4 **reply:** Martin et al. 1987 is now added to the reference list of th revised version..

5 - page 13362, l. 17: Mallon 2012 as in ref.-list?

6 **reply:** yes, corrected in the revised version.

7 - page 13380, Tab A3 Figure caption: Sections with. .

8 .

9 **reply:** - done -

10 - page 13387, Fig. 7: Please arrange the upper and the lower panel in such a way that the  
11 ages are in line with each other in order to make a comparison of both panels easy.  
12 Correlation of peaks is rather difficult at the present stage.

13 **reply:** both panels have the same x-axes scales in th revised version of Figure 7, which  
14 is now Figure 8, done -

15 - Remark: I would have liked to see a possibility (electronic supplements, link etc.) for an  
16 easy access to the complete data set used in this paper.

17 **reply:** we will provide all the CTD data of the new Figure 2 and the data of the new  
18 Figure 8 as electronic supplements (MS-Excel documents).

19 Referee #2 (anonymous)

20 1. Referee 2 complained that Table A3 listed the data directly from Kuhnt et al., 1990 implying  
21 an OAE2 duration of 1.3 million years. This needs to be adjusted according to latest  
22 agemodels. There is also the decision to be taken either to include all the other sections from  
23 the Tethys Ocean, and to discuss their implications in full detail including latest  
24 results, or to strictly stay with the Moroccan localities.

25 **reply:** the accumulation rates in Kuhnt et al (1990) were calculated for the *W.*  
26 *archaeocretacea* foraminifera Zone, with an assumed duration of 1.3 million years  
27 (based on the time scale of Haq et al., 1986). This did not imply an OAE-2 duration of  
28 1.3 million years, but it was at this time the only way to make sure, that all  
29 sedimentation rates were calculated for approximately the same time interval. High  
30 resolution  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  curves, which define the extend of OAE2 much better than foraminiferal

1 biozones were not available. However, this also means that the accumulation rates  
2 provided in Kuhnt et al. (1990) are minimum accumulation rates, since the period of  
3 high organic matter accumulation associated with OAE2 (approx. 800 kyr) is shorter  
4 than the *W. archaeocretacea* zone (approx 1300 kyr).

5

1 Furthermore, the first occurrence of *H. helvetica*, which defines the top of the *W.*  
2 *archaeocretacea* zone is in the Tarfaya sections later than its global first appearance  
3 datum (which is close to the FA of *Quadrum gartneri* just above the  
4 Cenomanian/Turonian boundary). Similar inconsistent FOs of *H. helvetica* have been  
5 recently reported from Tansania, and the reliability of the FA of *H. helvetica* as a  
6 stratigraphic datum is becoming questionable. However,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  stratigraphy and the FA of  
7 *Quadrum gartneri* are consistent in the Tarfaya basin and the accumulation rates  
8 calculated on the basis of these events in addition to cyclostratigraphy (new Figure 8 of  
9 the revised version) are thus more reliable.

10 In the present paper, we only mention the organic carbon accumulation rates from well  
11 S13. In order to avoid confusion that may arise from the data of the other sections  
12 mentioned in the Kuhnt et al. (1990) paper, we have decided to omit Appendix Table 3  
13 and referred to the original publication where more details can be found.

14 2. Referee 2 criticised absence of recent publications on the local and global redox state of  
15 the OAE2 ocean which could help our study to justify why it is important to understand  
16 these OMZ regions.

17 **reply:** we agree, only citing the book edited by Thiede and Suess (1983) is not enough  
18 to support our case. The Mesozoic Era is characterized by numerous oceanic anoxic  
19 events (OAEs) that are diagnostically expressed by widespread marine organic-carbon  
20 burial and coeval carbon-isotope excursions. Amongst the Cretaceous OAEs, the  
21 Cenomanian/Turonian boundary interval (OAE2) is probably the most extensive  
22 event. It is characterized by a globally recognized, stratigraphically distinct  
23 perturbation of the carbon cycle. For instance, redox-sensitive trace metal  
24 composition suggests contrasting depositional conditions and paleoceanographic  
25 processes in the western Tethys compared to the North Atlantic (Anbar and Rouxel,  
26 2007; Dale et al., 2012). Nevertheless both, the western Tethys and Northern Atlantic  
27 sites show redox variations, reaching anoxic/euxinic conditions during OAE2.  
28 Furthermore, combined carbon- and sulfur-isotope data have indicated that oxygen-  
29 free and hydrogen sulfide-rich waters extended across roughly 5% of the global  
30 ocean, compared to a negligible proportion today, but with the likelihood that much  
31 broader regions were also oxygen challenged. These conditions must have impacted  
32 nutrient availability in the ocean and ultimately the spatial and temporal distribution  
33 of marine life across a major climatic perturbation (Owens et al., 2013). Thus, we

1 argue that it is relevant to investigate meso scale processes such as modern and more  
2 recent OMZs in order to understand paleo OAEs, and vice versa. We referred to the  
3 abovementioned papers in the introduction of the revised manuscript.

4 3. Referee 2 asked for more discussion on the control of sedimentation rate on organic matter  
5 preservation, and he quoted that already Canfield (1994) has emphasized that bottom-  
6 water oxygenation is less important. The reviewer understood that sedimentation rates  
7 could be very important in the Peruvian OMZ where they also are very high compared to the  
8 OAE2 sites. Additionally, Hartnett et al. 1998 should be referenced.

9 **reply:** A large range of chemical, biological and oceanographical factors controlling organic  
10 detritus flux to the sea bed, decomposition and remineralisation, preservation and finally  
11 accumulation as refractory substances constitute the complex nature of organic matter  
12 turnover. Furthermore, organic carbon preservation strongly depends on the local  
13 circumstances of deposition (Arndt et al., 2013), thus limiting the comparability of settings  
14 between regions and oceanic basins. There is an ongoing debate whether the proportion of  
15 organic matter, which is buried and preserved in marine sediments, is dependant on the  
16 ambient bottom water oxygenation or not (Dale et al., 2014). The only assured perception is  
17 that carbon burial does not co-vary with bottom-water oxygenation at high sedimentation  
18 rates near continental margins (Betts and Holland, 1991; Canfield, 1994). At low  
19 sedimentation rates, the oxygenated near-surface layer of sediments deposited under  
20 oxygenated bottom water increases in thickness and facilitates enhanced aerobic  
21 decomposition, while sediments deposited under low-oxic conditions remain anaerobic and  
22 decomposition is effected by nitrate and sulphate reduction (Hartnett and Devol, 2003). As a  
23 consequence, organic carbon burial correlates with oxygen exposure time of particulate  
24 organic carbon at the sea floor in oxic to suboxic environments, and shows no covaraince in  
25 dysoxic zones (Hartnett et al. 1998). We added this paragraph to the discussion  
26 chapter of the revised version.

27 4. It is unclear to Referee 2 how the “20 % export production” value was obtained, and  
28 whether it is justified to apply this to OAE2 settings.

29 **reply:** This is certainly a misunderstanding. We meant burial efficiency and not export  
30 production here.

31 5. Referee 2 recognised several blanket statements needing clarification: “As a consequence,  
32 a whole suite of proxies have been applied to reconstruct past ocean oxygenation”  
33 reference has given to what proxies have been applied exactly. The statement "There are

1 only few reliable parameters that are sufficiently explored to investigate paleo low-oxygen  
2 conditions in the Mesozoic and Cenozoic, which are trace fossils, laminations, and organic  
3 carbon accumulation rates" seems to exclude many geochemical proxies applied with  
4 great success.

5 **reply 1:** The term "derivative" is more specific than saying "a whole suite of proxies",  
6 which are, by the way, explained in the following paragraphs. This is now amended in the  
7 revised version of the manuscript.

8 **reply 2:** we agree, many geochemical redox proxies have been applied on Cretaceous  
9 black shales. These include redox-sensitive trace metals (Brumsack, 2006; van Bentum  
10 et al., 2009; Dale et al., 2012), sulfur isotopes (Hetzl et al., 2009; Owens et al., 2013),  
11 and iron isotopes (Owens et al., 2012). Some of these proxies have also been measured  
12 on surface sediments from the Peruvian OMZ (Böning et al., 2004, Scholz et al., 2011,  
13 2014a). However, no calibration of these indicators is available for a quantitative  
14 reconstruction of past oxygenation of the Peruvian OMZ to date. This also hampers an  
15 application to black shales of OAE2. Most promising are U/Mo ratios, and there are first  
16 downcore records from the Peruvian OMZ (Scholz et al., 2014b). None-the-less, only  
17 very few data points are available for a regional U/Mo – bottom-water oxygen  
18 calibration in the Peruvian OMZ (Scholz et al., 2011). They strongly differ from  
19 corresponding data obtained from other OMZs (McManus et al., 2006), which hampers  
20 application to black shales from Cretaceous OAEs. A respective paragraph is now added  
21 to the revised version of the manuscript.

## 22 Minor comments

23 - Referee 2 requested more information in order to understand why there was an adjustment to  
24 the oxygen measurements. What is the detection limit of this method?

25 **reply:** This is probably a misunderstanding. We did **not** correct the data of the CTD sensors.  
26 The oxygen concentrations shown in the new Figure 2 are a compilation of all measurements  
27 done by CTD attached Seabird oxygen sensors during RS Meteor cruise M77 legs 1-3.  
28 Stations from leg 4 were not considered because all CTD-stations from leg 4 were located  
29 further offshore. The typical detection limit of the CTD optode sensors is ~2  $\mu\text{mol/kg}$ . In the  
30 study of Kalvelage et al. (2013) oxygen concentrations determined with the seabird sensor  
31 showed an offset of ~2  $\mu\text{mol/kg}$  compared to the concentrations determined with the more  
32 sensitive STOX sensors, which are based on Clark-type oxygen sensors, during M77 legs 3  
33 and 4. Hence, the data from the optode sensors were corrected by 2  $\mu\text{mol/kg}$ . Unfortunately no

1 STOX data is available for legs 1 and 2. Thus, we cannot assure that the optode data had the  
2 same offset during these legs. Furthermore, we wanted to present a dataset which is  
3 comparable to other datasets since the Seabird sensor is more commonly used than the STOX  
4 sensors. We changed the text in the methods to avoid further misunderstandings and added the  
5 following sentences: "Kalvelage et al. (2013) observed an offset of  $\sim 2 \mu\text{mol/kg}$  between the  
6 CTD attached optode oxygen sensors and the more sensitive STOX sensors, which are based  
7 on a Clark-type oxygen sensor, and corrected the optode data by  $2 \mu\text{mol/kg}$  during the cruises  
8 M77-3 and M77-4. The oxygen data presented in our study were not corrected for a  $2 \mu\text{mol/kg}$   
9 offset since the STOX sensors were not deployed during M77-1 and M77-2 cruises."

10 - Page 13353 Line 15 - It seems as though this sentence is putting an oxygen  
11 concentration from the modern to encompass all laminations from the late Holocene and  
12 subrecent sediments.

13 **reply:** this is probably a misunderstanding. Laminations were visible in the entire cores  
14 from the respective depths in the California borderland basins, despite the age of the  
15 core base. We amended the stratigraphic reach to „latest Holocene“ and hope this is now  
16 better understandable.

17 - Figure 4 Increase in lightness scatter? The red box seems to show a decrease? Is the  
18 red box in the correct place? Please clarify.

19 **reply:** indeed, the red box is in the correct place. We meant lightness variability, which  
20 obviously increases although the sediment colour appears to get darker. We amended  
21 the wording of the figure caption in the revised version of the manuscript accordingly.

22 - Page 13364 Line 6: Typo where I think the word should be combined to showed

23 **reply:** - done -

## 24 **References**

25 Anbar, A.D., Rouxel, O.: Metal Stable Isotopes in Paleoceanography, Annual Review  
26 of Earth and Planetary Sciences, 35, 717-746, doi:  
27 10.1146/annurev.earth.34.031405.125029, 2007.

28 Arndt, S., Jørgensen, B.B., LaRowe, D.E., Middelburg, J.J., Pancost, R.D., Regnier, P.:  
29 Quantifying the degradation of organic matter in marine sediments: A review and  
30 synthesis. Earth-Science Reviews, 123, 53–86, doi:10.1016/j.erscirev.2013.02.008,  
31 2013.

1 Betts, J.N., Holland, H.D.: The oxygen content of ocean bottom waters, the burial  
2 efficiency of organic carbon, and the regulation of atmospheric oxygen.  
3 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 97, 5–18, doi:10.1016/0921-  
4 8181(91)90123-E, 1991

5 Böning, P., Brumsack, H.J., Böttcher, M.E., Schnetger, B., Kriete, C., Kallmeyer, J., Borchers,  
6 S.L.: Geochemistry of Peruvian near-surface sediments, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*,  
7 68, 4429-4451, doi:/10.1016/j.gca.2004.04.027, 2004.

8 Brumsack, H.J.: The trace metal content of recent organic carbon-rich sediments: Implications  
9 for Cretaceous black shale formation, *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*,  
10 232, 344-361, doi:10.1016/j.palaeo.2005.05.011, 2006.

11 Canfield, D.E.: Factors influencing organic carbon preservation in marine sediments.  
12 *Chemical Geology*, 114, 315-329, doi:10.1016/0009-2541(94)90061-2, 1994.

13 Dale, A.W., Meyers, S.R., Aguilera, D.R., Arndt, S., Wallmann, K.: Controls on  
14 organic carbon and molybdenum accumulation in Cretaceous marine sediments from  
15 the Cenomanian–Turonian interval including Oceanic Anoxic Event 2. *Chemical*  
16 *Geology*, 324-325, 28-45, doi: 10.1016/j.chemgeo.2011.04.014, 2012.

17 Dale, A.W., Meyers, S.R., Aguilera, D.R., Arndt, S., Wallmann, K.: Controls on organic  
18 carbon and molybdenum accumulation in Cretaceous marine sediments from the  
19 Cenomanian–Turonian interval including Oceanic Anoxic Event 2. *Chemical Geology*, 324-  
20 325, 28-45, doi: 10.1016/j.chemgeo.2011.04.014, 2012.

21 Dale, A.W., Sommer, S., Lomnitz, U., Montes, I., Treude, T., Gier, J., Hensen, C.,  
22 Dengler, M., Stolpovsky, K., Bryant, L.D., Wallmann, K.: Organic carbon production,  
23 mineralization and preservation on the Peruvian margin. *Biogeosciences Discussions*,  
24 11, 13067-13126, doi:10.5194/bgd-11-13067-2014, 2014.

25 Hartnett, H.E., Devol, A.H. Role of a strong oxygen-deficient zone in the preservation  
26 and degradation of organic matter: a carbon budget for the continental margin of  
27 northwest Mexico and Washington State. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 67 , 2.,  
28 247–264, doi:10.1016/S0016-7037(02)01076-1, 2003.

29 Hartnett, H.E., Keil, R.G., Hedges, J.I., Devol, A.H.: Influence of oxygen exposure time  
30 on organic carbon preservation in continental margin sediments. *Nature*, 391, 572–574,  
31 doi:10.1038/35351, 1998.

32 Hetzel, A., Böttcher, M.E., Wortmann, U.G., Brumsack, H.J.: Paleo-redox conditions during

1 OAE 2 reflected in Demerara Rise sediment geochemistry (ODP Leg 207), *Palaeogeography,*  
2 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 273, 302-328, doi:10.1016/j.palaeo.2008.11.005, 2009.

3 Holbourn, A.E.L., Kuhnt, W.: Turonian-Santonian benthic foraminifer assemblages  
4 from Site 959D (Côte d'Ivoire-Ghana transform margin, equatorial Atlantic): Indication  
5 of a Late Cretaceous oxygen minimum zone, *Proc. ODP Sci. Res.*, 159, 375–387,  
6 doi:10.2973/odp.proc.sr.159.038.19981998.

7 Hoogakker, B., Elderfield, H., Oliver, K., Crowburst, S.: Benthic foraminiferal oxygen  
8 isotope offsets over the last glacial-interglacial cycle, *Paleoceanography*, vol.25,  
9 PA4229, doi:10.1029/2009PA001870, 2010

10 Kalvelage, T., Lavik, G., Lam, P., Contreras, S., Arteaga, L., Löscher, C. R., Oschlies, A.,  
11 Paulmier, A., Stramma, L., Kuypers, M. M. M.: Nitrogen cycling driven by organic matter  
12 export in the South Pacific oxygen minimum zone, *Nat. Geosci.* 6, 228-234, doi:  
13 10.1038/ngeo1739, 2013.

14 Kuhnt, W., Herbin, J.P., Thurow, J., Wiedmann, J.: Distribution of Cenomanian-  
15 Turonian Organic Facies in the Western Mediterranean and along the Adjacent Atlantic  
16 Margin, in: *Deposition of Organic Facies*, edited by: Huc, A.Y., AAPG Stud. Geol., 30,  
17 133-160, 1990.

18 McCorkle, D.C., Keigwin, L.D., Corliss, B.H., Emerson, S.R.: The influence of microhabitats  
19 on the carbon isotopic composition of deep-sea benthic foraminifera, *Paleoceanography* 5, 2,  
20 161-185, doi: 10.1029/PA005i002p00161, 1990.

21 McManus, J., Berelson, W.M., Severmann, S., Poulson, R.L., Hammond, D.E., Klinkhammer,  
22 G.P., Holm, C.: Molybdenum and uranium geochemistry in continental margin sediments:  
23 Paleoproxy potential, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 70, 4643-4662,  
24 doi:10.1016/j.gca.2006.06.1564, 2006.

25 Owens, J.D., Gill, B.C., Jenkyns, H.C., Bates, S.M., Severmann, S., Kuypers, M.M.,  
26 Woodfine, R.G., Lyons, T.W.: Sulfur isotopes track the global extent and dynamics of  
27 euxinia during Cretaceous Oceanic Anoxic Event 2. *PNAS*, 110 (46), 18407-18412,  
28 doi:10.1073/pnas.1305304110, 2013.

29 Owens, J.D., Gill, B.C., Jenkyns, H.C., Bates, S.M., Severmann, S., Kuypers, M.M.M.,  
30 Woodfine, R.G., Lyons, T.W.: Sulfur isotopes track the global extent and dynamics of euxinia  
31 during Cretaceous Oceanic Anoxic Event 2, *PNAS*, 110, 18407-18412,  
32 doi:10.1073/pnas.1305304110, 2013.

1 Owens, J.D., Lyons, T.W., Li, X., Macleod, K.G., Gordon, G., Kuypers, M.M.M., Anbar, A.,  
2 Kuhnt, W., Severmann, S.: Iron isotope and trace metal records of iron cycling in the proto-  
3 North Atlantic during the Cenomanian-Turonian oceanic anoxic event (OAE-2),  
4 *Paleoceanography*, 27, 1944-9186, doi:10.1029/2012PA002328, 2012.

5 Scholz, F., Hensen, C., Noffke, A., Rhode, A., Wallmann, K.: Early diagenesis of redox-  
6 sensitive trace metals in the Peru upwelling area – response to ENSO-related oxygen  
7 fluctuations in the water column, *Geochimica Cosmochimica Acta*, 22, 7247-7276, 2011.

8 Scholz, F., McManus, J., Mix, A.C., Hensen, C., Schneider, R.: The impact of ocean  
9 deoxygenation on iron release from continental margin sediments, *Nature Geoscience*, 7, 433–  
10 437, doi:10.1038/ngeo2162, 2014b.

11 Scholz, F., Severmann, S., McManus, J., Hensen, C.: Beyond the Black Sea paradigm: The  
12 sedimentary fingerprint of an open-marine iron shuttle, *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*,  
13 127, 368-380, doi:10.1016/j.gca.2013.11.041, 2014a

14 Thiede, J., Suess, E. (eds.): Coastal Upwelling: Its sediment record, Part B:  
15 Sedimentary Records of Ancient Coastal Upwelling, NATO Conference Series IV:  
16 Mar. Sci., Vol. 10b, 610 p., 1983.

17 van Bentum, E.C., Hetzel, A., Brumsack, H.J., Forster, A., Reichart, G.J., Sinninghe Damsté,  
18 J.S.: Reconstruction of water column anoxia in the equatorial Atlantic during the  
19 Cenomanian–Turonian oceanic anoxic event using biomarker and trace metal proxies,  
20 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 280, 489-498,  
21 doi:10.1016/j.palaeo.2009.07.003, 2009.