

Department of Earth Sciences
University of Toronto

March 30, 2015

To Dr. Tina Treude,

Thank you for considering our original submission entitled “*Pleistocene sediment offloading and the global sulfur cycle*” by Markovic and colleagues. We were pleased to see the paper go out for review and even more pleased with the constructive and critical nature of those reviews. We have now had a chance to think about the questions raised during this process, and have worked to satisfy them in full.

In what follows we provide a point-by-point response to all three reviews and a marked-up manuscript version with major changes manuscript changes. Note that all minor editorial points have been managed, but are not marked in this manuscript version.

Thank you again for your consideration and we look forward to hearing from you.

On behalf of my co-authors,

Stefan Markovic

stefa.markovic@utoronto.ca

Comments by P. Meister

General comments

The main result consists of a $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ record of sedimentary barite from the Eastern Equatorial Pacific. The barite was extracted from sediment cores of the Ocean Drilling Program. Furthermore, a mass balance model is presented to simulate the $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ of marine sulphate based on the main sources and sinks. A decrease in $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ of marine sulphate over the last 1.5 Ma is interpreted as result of pyrite oxidation due to offloading of shelf sediments during glacial sealevel lowstands.

The study is interesting to read and certainly an important contribution to the understanding of the sulphur cycle. The text is well written and figures are useful and clear. The interpretation seems well supported by the data and model results, respectively. Nevertheless, I mention a few thoughts that could be discussed in more detail and which may improve at the same time the clarity of the manuscript for the reader.

We thank Dr Meister for a constructive review and for his support of the study.

1) *During sealevel lowstand the zones of coastal upwelling would migrate further offshore and hence still be active in burial of pyrite but at greater water depth. As a result the deep water compartment would in fact counteract the effect of sediment offloading on the shelf. Therefore, it would be important to include the effect of changes in pyrite burial in the deep ocean compartment in the sensitivity study.*

This is an important point. The burial of pyrite in the deep sea is likely higher during lowstands. However, we note that the upwelling zones, although highly productive have a small areal extent, and thus a modest impact on the overall organic carbon burial (<10% Berner 1982, Hedges and Keil, 1995; Hu and Cai, 2011). Furthermore, pyrite burial is often limited in the upwelling zones by the lack of reactive iron (e.g., Morse and Emeis, 1990; Mossmann et al., 1991; Schenau et al., 2002; Brüchert et al., 2003; Suits and Arthur, 2000), and the majority of pyrite is actually buried in the continental shelf and estuaries (e.g., Berner 1982, Hu and Cai, 2011).

We added a note highlighting these relationships in the model discussion.

2) *If a higher flux of sulphide from the shelf occurs during glacial lowstand without compensation by another sink, the sulphate concentration in the ocean would increase. This would then not represent a real steady state. The authors should also discuss how a new steady state would look like if the increased influx of sulphate is compensated somewhere else. Possible sinks could be an upwelling zone that is shifted offshore, or a higher flux into evaporites due to higher sulphate concentration of seawater.*

Our model is not based on steady state assumptions, and fluxes react dynamically to sea level change. The sulfate concentrations increase by 1 to 3mM (depending on the size of pyrite reservoir in the shelf).

Pyrite burial and Δpyr are sensitive to changes of sulfate concentrations but only at low sulfate levels (Habicht et al., 2002; Wortmann and Chernyavsky, 2007). The changes suggested by our results are small compared to the already high sulfate concentrations before Quaternary (~25-29mM, Horita et al., 2002; Brennan et al., 2014; note that starting sulfate concentration in our model is 27mM). Therefore the impact of increased sulfate concentration on pyrite burial is likely negligible.

On the other hand, evaporite burial is not controlled by sulfate concentrations (Halevy et al., 2012); instead it is affected by occurrence of suitable sedimentary environments with high evaporation (Halevy et al., 2012). Thus we think that small increase of sulfate concentrations likely had no impact on the evaporite burial rates during Quaternary.

3) *Another sensitivity test would be to change only the Δpyr without the effect of sediment offloading. Likewise, the effect of changes in deep ocean pyrite burial should be visualized alone.*

This is an excellent idea and a point that we incorporated upon reading the comment. The new plot A1 shows the effect of Δpyr alone. Fig. 1 shows the impact of Δpyr change. During glaciations Δpyr increases which produces the positive shift of sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ values. This change is the most pronounced in the past 1Myr. We added this plot and a brief discussion in the revised text.

Holding all other parameters constant, we run sensitivity tests with pyrite burial alone. Model outputs lag behind isotope record and undershoot $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ regardless of the volume of initial fluxes. This suggests that changes of pyrite burial alone cannot account for the Quaternary seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ record. We added this plot in the Appendix and a brief discussion in the revised text.




Figure 1. Model output using variable Δ_{pyr} . Black solid line – model output produced assuming constant steady state fluxes and variable Δ_{pyr} . Green dashed line – model output produced assuming constant fluxes at 200% steady state values and variable Δ_{pyr} . Brown dashed line – model output produced assuming constant fluxes at 50% steady state values and variable Δ_{pyr} . The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval of a LOESS approximation of the “true” $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{SO}_4}$ composition. Note that the size of pyrite reservoir in these model experiments remains the same because input and output fluxes are kept constant.




Figure 2. Model output with variable pyrite burial and fixed weathering fluxes and Δ_{pyr} . Black solid line – model output produced assuming initial fluxes at steady state values, variable pyrite burial and fixed weathering fluxes and Δ_{pyr} . Green dashed line – model output produced assuming initial fluxes at 200% steady state values, variable pyrite burial and fixed weathering fluxes and Δ_{pyr} . Brown dashed line – model output produced assuming initial fluxes at 50% steady state values, variable pyrite burial, fixed weathering fluxes and Δ_{pyr} . The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval of a LOESS approximation of the “true” $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{SO}_4}$ composition.

4) *Generally, the Methods chapter includes a lot of discussion. This chapter could be significantly reduced in length if these discussions are moved to Results and Discussion.*

We agree that the methods section is indeed long. We believe that it should be as thorough as possible for anyone who would appreciate the added details concerning model development (or might want to replicate it). However, most of these details are only tangential to the main message of this study. Therefore, we think that moving

substantial part of Methods to Discussion section would only distract from it and disrupt the flow of ideas.

5) *Minor comments:*

p. 1208, line 14: "... Shipboard Scientific Party"

Thank you. Corrected.

p. 1208, line 24: The statement that sulphate reduction is not prevalent at the Eastern Equatorial Pacific sites because the sulphate concentration is not depleted is not necessarily true. Blake et al. (2006; Proc. ODP, Sci. Results, v. 201) showed based on $\delta^{18}O$ data that sulphate is being cycled.

This is indeed a very valid point. We thank you for pointing this out. We changed mentioned sentence: „These conditions suggest that the barite samples in sediments at these sites are not affected by barite dissolution and/or reprecipitation, and thus originate from sinking particles in the water column (e.g. marine barite).“

p. 1209, lines 6 – 12: This section should be part of the introduction.

Thank you for suggestion. We moved this part to introduction p.1207, line 27 to p.1208, line 4.

Figures: The time axis should be plotted from past to present from left to right.

A number of recent publications presented stable isotope results and model data from present to past from left to right (e.g., Turchyn and Schrag, 2004, 2006; Hoogakker et al., 2006; Elderfield et al., 2012; Lisiecki, 2014; Pena and Goldstein, 2014). On the other hand, there are also publications using different layout (e.g., Köhler and Bintanja, 2008; Clark et al., 2006). Since it appears that this is a matter of preference rather than convention we would prefer to retain the current layout, as to us, it makes more sense that the numbers (age before present) increase towards the right, rather than decrease.

References:

Berner, R. A.: Burial of organic carbon and pyrite sulfur in the modern ocean; its geochemical and environmental significance, *Am. J. Sci.*, 282(4), 451–473, doi:10.2475/ajs.282.4.451, 1982.

Brennan, S. T., Lowenstein, T. K. and Cendon, D. I.: The major-ion composition of cenozoic seawater: the past 36 million years from fluid inclusions in marine halite, *Am. J. Sci.*, 313, 713–775, doi:10.2475/08.2013.01, 2013.

Brüchert, V., Jørgensen, B. B., Neumann, K., Riechmann, D., Schlösser, M. and Schulz, H.: Regulation of bacterial sulfate reduction and hydrogen sulfide fluxes in the central Namibian coastal upwelling zone, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 67, 4505–4518, doi:10.1016/S0016-7037(03)00275-8, 2003.

Clark, P. U., Archer, D., Pollard, D., Blum, J. D., Rial, J. A., Brovkin, V., Mix, A. C., Pisias, N. G. and Roy, M.: The middle Pleistocene transition: characteristics, mechanisms, and implications for long-term changes in atmospheric $p\text{CO}_2$, *Quat. Sci. Rev.*, 25, 3150–3184, doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2006.07.008, 2006.

Elderfield, H., Ferretti, P., Greaves, M., Crowhurst, S., McCave, I. N., Hodell, D. and Piotrowski, A. M.: Evolution of Ocean Temperature and Ice Volume Through the Mid-Pleistocene Climate Transition, *Science* (80-.), 337, 704–709, doi:10.1126/science.1221294, 2012.

Halevy, I., Peters, S. E. and Fischer, W. W.: Sulfate Burial Constraints on the Phanerozoic Sulfur Cycle, *Science* (80-.), 337, 331–334, doi:10.1126/science.1220224, 2012.

Hedges, J. I. and Keil, R. G.: Sedimentary organic matter preservation: an assessment and speculative synthesis, *Mar. Chem.*, 49, 137–139, doi:10.1016/0304-4203(95)00013-H, 1995.

Hoogakker, B. A. A., Rohling, E. J., Palmer, M. R., Tyrrell, T. and Rothwell, R. G.: Underlying causes for long-term global ocean $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ fluctuations over the last 1.20 Myr, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 248, 1–15, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2006.05.007, 2006.

Horita, J., Zimmermann, H. and Holland, H. D.: Chemical evolution of seawater during the Phanerozoic: Implications from the record of marine evaporites, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 66, 3733–3756, doi:10.1016/S0016-7037(01)00884-5, 2002.

Hu, X. and Cai, W. J.: An assessment of ocean margin anaerobic processes on oceanic alkalinity budget, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 25, doi:10.1029/2010GB003859, 2011.

Köhler, P. and Bintanja, R.: The carbon cycle during the Mid Pleistocene Transition: the Southern Ocean Decoupling Hypothesis, *Clim. Past Discuss.*, 4, 809–858, doi:10.5194/cpd-4-809-2008, 2008.

Morse, J. W. and Emeis, K. C.: Controls on C/S ratios in hemipelagic upwelling sediments, *Am. J. Sci.*, 290, 1117–1135, doi:10.2475/ajs.290.10.1117, 1990.

Mossmann, J.-R., Aplin, A. C., Curtis, C. D. and Coleman, M. L.: Geochemistry of inorganic and organic sulphur in organic-rich sediments from the Peru Margin, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 55, 3581–3595, doi:10.1016/0016-7037(91)90057-C, 1991.

- Habicht, K. S., Gade, M., Thamdrup, B., Berg, P. and Canfield, D. E.: Calibration of sulfate levels in the archean ocean., *Science*, 298, 2372–2374, doi:10.1126/science.1078265, 2002.
- Lisiecki, L. E.: Atlantic overturning responses to obliquity and precession over the last 3 Myr, *Paleoceanography*, 29, 71–86, doi:10.1002/2013PA002505, 2014.
- Pena, L. D. and Goldstein, S. L.: Thermohaline circulation crisis and impacts during the mid-Pleistocene transition., *Science* (80-.), 345, 318–322, doi:10.1126/science.1249770, 2014.
- Schenau, S. J., Passier, H. F., Reichert, G. J. and De Lange, G. J.: Sedimentary pyrite formation in the Arabian Sea, *Mar. Geol.*, 185, 393–402, doi:10.1016/S0025-3227(02)00183-4, 2002.
- Suits, N. S. and Arthur, M. A.: Sulfur diagenesis and partitioning in Holocene Peru shelf and upper slope sediments, *Chem. Geol.*, 163, 219–234, doi:10.1016/S0009-2541(99)00114-X, 2000.
- Turchyn, A. V and Schrag, D. P.: Oxygen isotope constraints on the sulfur cycle over the past 10 million years., *Science*, 303, 2004–2007, doi:10.1126/science.1092296, 2004.
- Turchyn, A. V. and Schrag, D. P.: Cenozoic evolution of the sulfur cycle: Insight from oxygen isotopes in marine sulfate, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.*, 241, 763–779, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2005.11.007, 2006.
- Wortmann, U. G., and Chernyavsky, B. M.: Effect of evaporite deposition on Early Cretaceous carbon and sulphur cycling, *Nature*, 446, 654-656, 10.1038/nature05693, 2007.

Comments by Anonymous Referee #2

The manuscript by Marcovich et al. describes how quaternary sea level fluctuations have affected the oceanic sulfur budget through massive movement of sediment off the shelf. They use sulfur isotopic records from two IODP drill cores from the Eastern Equatorial Pacific. The study is very well written and relatively easy to understand, even for someone who is not completely familiar with this research area. It is a valuable addition to our understanding of the sulfur cycle.

We thank the referee for her/his support of the study.

There are a few minor points that I would like to see discussed in a bit more detail or changed to improve clarity.

1) Page 1214, line 5ff: Sediment offloading will also introduce pyrite and OM into the abyssal box, but it will not be counted, because it is already accounted for in the shelf box.

While I agree that you should not count things twice, I wonder how much of the pyrite that is moved from the shelf into the abyss will be oxidized because oxygen penetration depths in abyssal sediments are usually much greater.

This is indeed a valid point which we immediately incorporated upon reading the comment. Physical reworking of sediment promotes pyrite oxidation (Calmels et al., 2007). Therefore, if sediment transfer is slow and includes physical erosion, suspension and deposition, we would expect that pyrite is already oxidized before sediments reach abyssal plain. In case of instant sediment transfer (i.e., gravity flows) we would expect that pyrite is oxidized *in situ* after deposition. While we cannot quantify the proportion of pyrite oxidized in this manner we note that abyssal plains along continental margins are dotted with the evidence of this sediment transfer which is generally thought to occur during glaciations (Weaver et al., 2000; Piper and Normark, 2009; Meiburg and Kneller, 2010). After emplacement, molecular oxygen diffuses into sediments and oxidizes organic matter and sulfides (Colley et al., 1984; Cowie et al., 1995; Thomson et al., 1998; Robinson, 2001). The process will continue until diffusive supply of oxygen is interrupted either through deposition of pelagic sediment or another turbidite layer. Depending on the sediment accumulation rates and turbidite frequency in particular region, oxidation can last a few thousand to >10 kyrs (Cowie et al., 1995; Thomson et al., 1998; De Lange, 1998; Robinson, 2001).

The language in the revised paper is now changed to recognize this as one of the possible pathways of shelf pyrite oxidation. We thank the reviewer for this suggestion.

2) Page 1216, line 11: Please check spelling of "environments"

Done.

3) Page 1221, line 9: What do you mean by "moderately sensitive"? This is a phrase that can mean almost anything.

This is a very good point. Thank you for drawing our attention to this ambiguity. We have changed the language and we now use:

“The model output is affected by the initial size of pyrite shelf sub-reservoir (Fig. 5).“

4) Page 1223, line 3ff: If there is a connection between build up of oceanic DIC from pyrite oxidation and jumps in atmospheric CO₂, would it be possible to show them? This is an interesting aspect and your arguments are compelling, but I would like to see something like a "smoking gun". Can you prepare a graph that shows this relationship?

Thank you for your comment. At this point, using our sulfur cycle model and $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ data we can only calculate DIC input as a result of the imbalance between pyrite weathering (input flux) and pyrite burial (sink). Figure 1A shows temporal changes of DIC input for base model scenario assuming initial fluxes at steady state values. The cumulative DIC input over the past 3Myr is shown on Fig. 1B.

Due to complex behavior of different carbonate species in atmosphere-seawater system we cannot delineate the impact of excess DIC (Figure 1) on atmospheric CO₂ concentration. This would require a carbon isotope mass balance model which connects competing effects of weathering, organic matter burial and decomposition, carbonate burial and dissolution. Since this is well beyond the scope of this paper we changed the language in the last section of discussion and dropped the sentence that suggested the direct link between sulfide oxidation and the long term Pleistocene CO₂ variations. We hope, however, that this research will stimulate discussion that in turn will lead to more thorough understanding of the role sulfide oxidation played in modulating inorganic carbon budget during Pleistocene.




Figure 1. DIC release as a result of pyrite weathering. (a) The temporal change of DIC input calculated from the balance between pyrite weathering and pyrite burial. Note that weathering of pyrite releases two moles of DIC per each mole of S. Conversely sulfate reduction and subsequent burial of pyrite reverse this DIC increase through authigenic carbonate precipitation (e.g. Hu and Cai, 2011; Torres et al., 2014; Sun and Turchyn, 2014) (b) Cumulative DIC release as a result of pyrite weathering

5) *Graphs A1 to A4: The graphs are nice, but in order to make a direct comparison between the different model runs I would rather like to see them as a single panel with 4 sub-graphs instead of 4 separate figures. Plotting them all into one graph will not work as they are too similar.*

This is a great idea! We have merged Figures A1-A4.

References:

- Calmels, D., Gaillardet, J., Brenot, A., and France-Lanord, C.: Sustained sulfide oxidation by physical erosion processes in the Mackenzie River basin: Climatic perspectives, *Geology*, 35, 1003–1006, 10.1130/g24132a.1, 2007.
- Colley, S., Thomson, J., Wilson, T. R. . and Higgs, N. .: Post-depositional migration of elements during diagenesis in brown clay and turbidite sequences in the North East Atlantic, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 48, 1223–1235, doi:10.1016/0016-7037(84)90057-7, 1984.
- Cowie and G: Elemental and major biochemical changes across an oxidation front in a relict turbidite: An oxygen effect, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 59, 33–46, doi:10.1016/00167-0379(40)0329K-, 1995.
- Hu, X. and Cai, W. J.: An assessment of ocean margin anaerobic processes on oceanic alkalinity budget, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 25, doi:10.1029/2010GB003859, 2011.
- De Lange, G. J.: 33. Oxidic vs. anoxic diagenetic alteration of turbidite sediments in the Madeira Abyssal Plain, eastern North Atlantic, in Weaver, Schmincke, Firth and Duffield (Eds.): *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Scientific Results*, vol. 157, pp. 573–579., 1998.
- Meiburg, E. and Kneller, B.: Turbidity Currents and Their Deposits, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*, 42, 135–156, doi:10.1146/annurev-fluid-121108-145618, 2010.
- Piper, D. J. W. and Normark, W. R.: Processes That Initiate Turbidity Currents and Their Influence on Turbidites: A Marine Geology Perspective, *J. Sediment. Res.*, 79, 347–362, doi:10.2110/jsr.2009.046, 2009.
- Robinson, S. G.: Early diagenesis in an organic-rich turbidite and pelagic clay sequence from the Cape Verde Abyssal Plain, NE Atlantic: Magnetic and geochemical signals, *Sediment. Geol.*, 143, 91–123, doi:10.1016/S0037-0738(00)00187-1, 2001.
- Sun, X. and Turchyn, A. V.: Significant contribution of authigenic carbonate to marine carbon burial, *Nat. Geosci.*, 8, 201–204, doi:10.1038/ngeo2070, 2014.
- Thomson, J., Jarvis, I., Green, D. R. H. and Green, D.: Oxidation fronts in Madeira abyssal plain turbidites: Persistence of early diagenetic trace-element enrichments during burial, site 950, in Weaver, Schmincke, Firth and Duffield (Eds.): *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Scientific Results*, vol. 157, pp. 559–571, Ocean Drilling Program. [online] Available from: <http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=2439726> (Accessed 20 March 2015), 1998.
- Torres, M. a, West, a J. and Li, G.: Sulphide oxidation and carbonate dissolution as a source of CO₂ over geological timescales., *Nature*, 507, 346–9, doi:10.1038/nature13030, 2014.
- Weaver, P. P. E., Wynn, R. B., Kenyon, N. H. and Evans, J.: Continental margin sedimentation, with special reference to the north-east Atlantic margin, *Sedimentology*, 47, 239–256, doi:10.1046/j.1365-3091.2000.0470s1239.x, 2000.

Comments by B. Mayer

The authors have composed a well-written manuscript describing and interpreting a high-resolution sulfur isotope record of marine sulfate determined on authigenic marine barite crystals from an Eastern Equatorial Pacific ODP site spanning the last 3 million years. The manuscript is written in a logical sequence, is well organized, easy to read and understand. Previous literature is appropriately considered and figures and tables are of good quality. Most conclusions appear well supported by the provided data and by the utilized sulfur cycling model. The analytical approaches are very sophisticated giving confidence in the presented data. The authors describe a $>1.0\%$ decrease in $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ of marine sulfate from circa 22.0 ‰ to $<21.0\%$ with the majority of the change occurring between 1.5 and 1.0 Ma. The authors use a sulfur cycle model to conclude that erosion during sea level low-stands was only partly compensated by increased sedimentation during times of sea level high-stands, an interpretation that appears well justified based on the presented data and model runs.

We thank Dr Mayer for his support of the study.

1) *The authors suggest that the observed decrease in $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ is related to the Milankovic cycle driven change from 41 kyr (and 23 kyr) interglacial-glacial periodicity earlier in the Pleistocene to 100 kyr by 700,000 years ago. While the end of the reported $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ decrease described in this manuscript is consistent with this interpretation, the question arises why the decrease in $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ values of marine sulfate started as early as 1.5 Ma ago if it is linked to 100 kya cycles? To my best knowledge, oxygen isotope records of benthic foraminifera place this transition somewhere between 1.0 and 0.7 Ma ago (e.g. Ruddiman, W. F. (2008): *Earth's Climate*, Freeman & Co, New York), but your Figure 2 indicates that a 0.7 ‰ shift in $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ of marine sulfate had already occurred between 1.5 and 1.2 Ma ago, which appears inconsistent with the larger 100,000 yrs interglacial-glacial periodicity capable of removing much larger sediment loads from the shelf. The authors should add some explanation on the timing of this early onset of the decrease in $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ of marine sulfate reported in their paper, and possibly compare it to the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ record of benthic foraminifera, which has reportedly been used for age-dating the samples (page 1209, line 3).*

This is a very perceptive catch and something that we have overlooked. While the “true” 100kyr cycles did not appear until ~900ka (e.g., Elderfield et al., 2012; Pena and Goldstein, 2014) the early signs of change in amplitude and duration of glaciations probably took place ~1250ka (e.g., Clark et al., 2006; Lisiecki, 2014). The LR04 stack of globally distributed benthic foraminifera $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ records indicates increased severity of glaciations as early as 1.5Ma (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005; Clark et al. 2006). More pronounced sea level low stands from 1.5Ma to 0.7Ma are reflection of this change (see Figure 1 in discussion paper, data from Miller et al. 2011). It is this lower sea level during

glaciations that resulted in increased weathering of shelf pyrite. However, the language we used obscured this main point and suggested that $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ shift is a result of longer glaciations, when in fact it is due to progressively lower sea level and associated aerial exposure of previously inundated continental shelf (Figure 1 in discussion paper). We thank the reviewer for pointing out this ambiguity and we changed the language throughout the text to make it clearer what is the main driver of shift in seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value.

2) *I am also curious why organic sulfur compounds receive so little attention in the sulfur cycling models, but assume that they play only a very minor role in the reported S fluxes. Nevertheless it should be acknowledged (e.g. on page 1217, line 10) that some sulfur is also buried in organic form.*

This is indeed something that we have overlooked. We thank the reviewer for this suggestion and we added the following: “Also note that the burial of organic sulfur is poorly constrained (Werne et al., 2004). Although it is generally considered to be minor compared to pyrite burial (e.g., Goldhaber, 2003; Werne et al., 2004), in some environments (e.g. Peru shelf, the Miocene Monterey Formation, marine sapropels) it is the dominant form of reduced solid sulfur compounds (e.g., Mossman et al., 1991; Canfield et al., 1998; Suits and Arthur, 2000).”

3) *And finally, in section 4.2 the authors comment on the link between pyrite oxidation, acidification-enhanced carbonate dissolution/precipitation and associated CO₂ release into the atmosphere. While I agree with the principle geochemical arguments, I am a bit puzzled about the link of the here presented data showing a $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ decrease in marine sulfate starting 1.5 mio years ago and ending 700,000 years ago, and the claim that this is partly related to CO₂ increases 600kyr and 400kyr ago. The authors should provide further arguments on the temporal connections of their S isotope record with the ice core CO₂ record in order to substantiate their argument of a causal relationship.*

We thank you for this comment, which identified the area where we probably promised more than we can deliver at this point. The language we used in discussion might have erroneously suggested that there is a direct link between sulfide oxidation and atmospheric CO₂. However, this link is indirect and complex.

While sulfide weathering increases the dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) amount in the ocean (Hu and Cai, 2011; Torres et al., 2014,) CO₂ is released only after precipitation of calcium carbonate. Characteristic time scales for this process are in the 100-200 kyr range (Sundquist and Visser, 2003; Zeebe and Wolf-Gladrow, 2009) and therefore, DIC addition and CO₂ release are not synchronized. It is possible that competing effects of biological pump and carbonate precipitation resulted in the increase of atmospheric CO₂ some time after the pulse of DIC produced during sulfide oxidation. However, the temporal changes of these processes are well beyond the scope of this paper. We therefore changed the language in the last section of discussion and dropped the

suggestion that there is a direct link between CO₂ concentrations and increased pyrite weathering.

On a technical note, $\delta^{34}S$ should be followed by “values” ($\delta^{34}S$ values) rather than “compositions” and certainly not “ratios”.

Thank you for the comment. We changed the language throughout the text.

Table A1: add units (‰) after $\delta^{34}S$ and use same number of significant digits behind the comma for reporting the results;

Done.

Figure 4, y-axis label, unit missing (‰).

Corrected.

References:

- Canfield, D. E., Boudreau, B. P., Mucci, A. and Gundersen, J. K.: The early diagenetic formation of organic sulfur in the sediments of Mangrove Lake, Bermuda, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 62, 767–781, doi:10.1016/S0016-7037(98)00032-5, 1998.
- Clark, P. U., Archer, D., Pollard, D., Blum, J. D., Rial, J. A., Brovkin, V., Mix, A. C., Pisias, N. G. and Roy, M.: The middle Pleistocene transition: characteristics, mechanisms, and implications for long-term changes in atmospheric pCO₂, *Quat. Sci. Rev.*, 25, 3150–3184, doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2006.07.008, 2006.
- Elderfield, H., Ferretti, P., Greaves, M., Crowhurst, S., McCave, I. N., Hodell, D. and Piotrowski, A. M.: Evolution of Ocean Temperature and Ice Volume Through the Mid-Pleistocene Climate Transition, *Science* (80-.), 337, 704–709, doi:10.1126/science.1221294, 2012.
- Goldhaber, M.: Sulfur-rich sediments, *Treatise on Geochemistry*, 254–288, doi:10.1016/B0-08-043751-6/07139-5, 2003.
- Hu, X. and Cai, W. J.: An assessment of ocean margin anaerobic processes on oceanic alkalinity budget, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 25, doi:10.1029/2010GB003859, 2011.
- Lisiecki, L. E.: Atlantic overturning responses to obliquity and precession over the last 3 Myr, *Paleoceanography*, 29, 71–86, doi:10.1002/2013PA002505, 2014.
- Lisiecki, L. E. and Raymo, M. E.: A Pliocene-Pleistocene stack of 57 globally distributed benthic $\delta^{18}O$ records, *Paleoceanography*, 20, 1–17, doi:10.1029/2004PA001071, 2005.

Miller, K., Mountain, G., Wright, J. and Browning, J.: A 180-Million-Year Record of Sea Level and Ice Volume Variations from Continental Margin and Deep-Sea Isotopic Records, *Oceanography*, 24, 40–53, doi:10.5670/oceanog.2011.26, 2011.

Mossmann, J.-R., Aplin, A. C., Curtis, C. D. and Coleman, M. L.: Geochemistry of inorganic and organic sulphur in organic-rich sediments from the Peru Margin, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 55, 3581–3595, doi:10.1016/0016-7037(91)90057-C, 1991.

Pena, L. D. and Goldstein, S. L.: Thermohaline circulation crisis and impacts during the mid-Pleistocene transition., *Science* (80-.), 345, 318–322, doi:10.1126/science.1249770, 2014.

Suits, N. S. and Arthur, M. A.: Sulfur diagenesis and partitioning in Holocene Peru shelf and upper slope sediments, *Chem. Geol.*, 163, 219–234, doi:10.1016/S0009-2541(99)00114-X, 2000.

Sundquist, E. T. and Visser, K.: The Geologic History of the Carbon Cycle, in *Treatise on Geochemistry*, vol. 8, edited by W. H. H. D. H. and K. K. T. Schlesinger., pp. 425–472, Elsevier., 2003.

Torres, M. a, West, a J. and Li, G.: Sulphide oxidation and carbonate dissolution as a source of CO₂ over geological timescales., *Nature*, 507, 346–9, doi:10.1038/nature13030, 2014.

Werne, J. P., Hollander, D. J., Lyons, T. W. and Sinninghe Damsté, J. S.: Organic sulfur biogeochemistry: Recent advances and future research directions, *Geol. Soc. Am. Spec. Pap.*, 379, 135–150, doi:10.1130/0-8137-2379-5.135, 2004.

Zeebe, R. E. and Wolf-Gladrow, D. A.: Carbon Dioxide, Dissolved (Ocean), in *Encyclopedia of Paleoclimatology and Ancient Environments*, edited by V. Gornitz, pp. 123–127, Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht., 2009.

Pleistocene sediment offloading and the global sulfur cycle

S. Markovic^{1*}, A. Paytan², and U. G. Wortmann¹

[1] Department of Geology, University of Toronto, 22 Russell St. M5S3B1, Toronto, Canada

[2] Institute of Marine Sciences, University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA 94064, USA

Correspondence to: S. Markovic (stefa.markovic@utoronto.ca)

Abstract

Quaternary sea level fluctuations have greatly affected the sediment budgets of the continental shelves. Previous studies suggested that this caused a considerable increase in the net loss of shelf sediments. Since sediment accumulation and erosion are closely tied to the formation and re-oxidation of pyrite, we use a high resolution record of sulfur isotope ratios ($^{34}\text{S}/^{32}\text{S}$) of marine sulfate to evaluate the implications of the so called “shelf sediment offloading” on the global sulfur cycle. Modeling of our $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ record suggests that erosion during sea level lowstands was only partly compensated by increased sedimentation during times of rising sea level and sea level highstands. Furthermore, our data suggests that shelf systems reached a new equilibrium state about 700 kyr ago, which considerably slowed or terminated shelf sediment offloading.

1 Introduction

Pliocene-Early Pleistocene was characterized by relatively small (20-50m) but frequent sea level changes in the precession and obliquity frequency bands (Miller et al., 2011). During the Mid-Pleistocene, this pattern changed and large sea-level fluctuations in the 100ky frequency range gradually became dominant. At times, global sea-level dropped as low as 130-150m below present day sea level (Miller et al., 2011), exposing large areas of shelf to weathering and erosion. These sea level changes must have fundamentally altered the balance between sedimentation and erosion on continental shelves. Hay and Southam (1977) proposed that the repeated exposure and inundation of the continental shelves has led to a massive transfer of

1 sediments from continental shelves to the deep ocean. They estimate that as much as 5×10^{21} g
2 of detrital sediment may have been removed by this so called “sediment offloading” (Hay and
3 Southam, 1977).

4 Although intuitively a convincing hypothesis, a quantitative analysis which includes the rates
5 of sediment delivery to the deep ocean is missing. Hay and Southam (1977) hypothesized
6 that the pattern of sea level falls controls the sediment delivery into the deep ocean. For
7 example, during the first large sea level drop sediment transfer would be exceptionally large
8 and the intensity of sediment erosion will decrease with consequent events, as the sediment
9 reservoir available for erosion will become depleted (Hay and Southam, 1977; Hay, 1998;
10 Hay et al., 2002).

11 Adding/removing sediments from the shelf is closely coupled to the burial/erosion of pyrite in
12 those sediments. During interglacials, high sea levels result in expanded shelf areas.
13 Coincidentally, the shelf areas are characterized by high pyrite burial rates (Jørgensen, 1982;
14 Berner, 1982). During sea level lowstands, formerly inundated shelf areas are being replaced
15 by low-lying coastal plains transected by rivers. This affects sedimentary sulfur cycling in two
16 ways: 1) pyrite burial is reduced; 2) fine grained and unlithified sediments in the exposed
17 shelf (de Haas et al., 2002) are eroded (Gibbs and Kump, 1994; Foster and Vance, 2006) and
18 pyrite and organic sulfur (S) contained in the eroded sediments will be oxidized (Turchyn and
19 Schrag, 2004).

20 Pyrite formation is mediated by microbial sulfate reduction (MSR) and microbial sulfur
21 disproportionation, which produce a large S-isotope ratio difference between pyrite and
22 concomitant seawater sulfate (up to 70‰, Canfield and Thamdrup, 1994; Wortmann et al.,
23 2001; Rudnicki et al., 2001; Böttcher et al., 2001&2005; Brunner and Bernasconi, 2005; Sim
24 et al., 2011). Accordingly, the burial of large amounts of pyrite will result in a more positive
25 sulfur isotope value of seawater sulfate ($\delta^{34}\text{S}$), whereas the oxidation of large amounts of
26 pyrite will cause a decrease of the seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value. In the following, we take
27 advantage of this relationship and use past changes of seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value to track
28 changes in pyrite burial/oxidation on continental shelves and their relation to changes in
29 global sea level.

30 The $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value of seawater sulfate is uniform throughout the ocean, reflecting the long
31 residence time of marine sulfate (~ 10-20Myr, Jørgensen and Kasten, 2006) compared to the
32 ocean mixing time (~1600 yrs). The evolution of the $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value of sulfate thus serves as a
33 proxy for past changes in the sulfur cycle (Paytan et al., 1998&2004; Wortmann and
34 Chernyavsky, 2007; Wortmann and Paytan, 2012).

35 Authigenic marine barite crystals continuously record past changes of seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$
36 value (Paytan et al., 1998). Here we use a new high resolution marine barite $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ record of the
37 last 3 Million years (Ma) to delineate the onset and duration of these changes, which allows
38 us to validate/test the shelf sediment offloading hypothesis.

2 Geological Setting

We use sediment samples from Eastern Equatorial Pacific Sites 849D (0°10.993'N, 110°31.167'W) and 851B (2°46.223'N, 110°34.308'W) obtained by advanced piston coring (APC) during Leg 138 of the Ocean Drilling program (ODP). Site 849D is located below a highly productive equatorial divergence zone at a depth of 3839m (Shipboard Scientific party, 1992a). Site 851B is located within the northern limit of western-flowing South Equatorial Current at the depth of 3760m, within the equatorial high productivity zone (Shipboard Scientific Party, 1992b).

Sediments at both locations consist of diatom nannofossil ooze (Shipboard Scientific Party, 1992a&b). Sedimentation rates were moderate since the late Pliocene varying between 25-35m/Myr at Site 849D and 15-20m/Myr at Site 851B (Shipboard Scientific Party, 1992a&b).

Marine barite forms in the water column recording seawater S isotope ratios (Griffith and Paytan, 2012). After burial in the sediment, barite is stable during diagenesis except in environments with high rates of sulfate reduction where sulfate in pore waters is exhausted (e.g., Torres et al., 1996; Griffith and Paytan, 2012). In sulfate reducing environments, barite is soluble releasing barium to solution. This barium will diffuse and barite will reprecipitate forming diagenetic barite with typically anomalously high $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ signatures (Paytan et al., 2002). Sites 849D and 851B are characterized by low organic matter (OM) concentrations and high sulfate concentrations in the interstitial waters (0.2 wt%, OM, 25-28mM SO_4^{2-} , Shipboard Scientific Party, 1992a&b). These conditions suggest that the barite samples in sediments at these sites are not affected by barite dissolution and/or reprecipitation, and thus originate from sinking particles in the water column (e.g. marine barite).

Sample ages are estimated using high resolution (10-50kyr) orbitally tuned age models by Shackleton et al. (1995) which are based on magnetostratigraphy, biostratigraphy, gamma ray attenuation porosity measurements (GRAPE) and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ records of benthic foraminifera.

3 Methods

Here, we used the sequential dissolution method of Paytan et al. (1996) to extract barite crystals from marine sediments. We have modified the original method to better address concerns about pyrite contamination (DeBond et al., 2012) and to improve the workflow. Unlike the original method organic matter is removed by heating the sample in the furnace at 700°C instead of oxidizing it with hot bleach overnight. We also changed the order of the extraction steps so that iron and manganese oxyhydroxides are now dissolved with 0.2 N hydroxylamine hydrochloride in 25% acetic acid at the end of the process. Between steps we centrifuged samples, decanted the supernatant and washed the residue three times with ultrapure deionized water.

In order to prevent oxidation of reduced sulfur during the carbonate leaching process, we added 50ml of 5% tin chloride (SnCl_2) solution to 1l of HCl to maintain reducing conditions

during the leaching step (instead of bubbling N₂ gas as in the original procedure). In addition, the HCl is flushed with Argon before the carbonate dissolution. This is the step we expected pyrite to be prone to oxidation if present in the sediments.

We examined the purity of the extracted barite with X-ray diffraction. Furthermore, we checked for presence of diagenetic barite using Scanning electron microscopy and Energy dispersive X-ray spectroscopy (Paytan et al. 2002). If samples contained residual mineral phases like rutile, we dissolved the extracted barite with sodium carbonate and subsequently reprecipitated pure BaSO₄ (Breit et al., 1985).

3.1 Isotope analysis

Sulfur isotopes are analyzed with a continuous flow isotope ratio mass spectrometer system (CFIRMS) using an Eurovector Elemental Analyzer (EA) coupled via a Finnigan ConFlo III open split interface to a Finnigan MAT 253 mass spectrometer. Solid barite samples (200µg) are mixed in a tin cup with ~600µg of vanadium pentoxide (V₂O₅) powder and introduced into the EA, where the sulfate from barite (BaSO₄) is converted to sulfur dioxide gas (SO₂) by flash combustion at 1700°C in an oxygen atmosphere. Measurements are calibrated using international sulfate standards NBS 127, IAEA SO5 and IAEA SO6 (relative to Vienna Canyon Diablo Troilite, hereafter VCDT, +21.1 ‰, +0.49 ‰, -34.05 ‰, respectively, Coplen et al. 2001) and an in-house synthetic BaSO₄ (Sigma-Aldrich) standard (8.6 ‰, VCDT). Repeated measurements of the in-house standard (typically >10 measurements per run) and international standards (3-4 measurements per standard per run) yield an average reproducibility of 0.15‰ (1 standard deviation-σ).

3.2 Statistical analysis

The isotope data includes errors in sample assigned ages and uncertainties of how well a single measurement represents the seawater sulfate δ³⁴S value. Note that the latter uncertainty not only includes analytical precision (which can be quantified), but also sample origin, sample handling and sample extraction. We therefore have to assume that each measurement carries an unknown error (or noise).

However, the δ³⁴S value of seawater sulfate at any given time (t) depends to a certain degree on the δ³⁴S of sulfate at a given time before (t-Δt). This allows us to apply a “local regression smoothing” technique (LOESS, Cleveland, 1979) to estimate the likely value for the δ³⁴S of sulfate at any time of interest.

We used the default LOESS module provided by the statistical software package R (R Core Team, 2012). The 95% confidence interval is calculated for each data point from the standard errors returned by the LOESS function.

3.3 Sulfur Cycle Model

We describe the sulfur cycle using the following mass conservation equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} M_{SO_4}(t) = F_{wp}(t) - F_{bp}(t) + F_{we}(t) - F_{be} + F_v \quad (1)$$

where M_{SO_4} denotes the mass of sulfate in the ocean, calculated from the sulfate concentration and the ocean volume; F_{wp} and F_{we} denote the pyrite and evaporite weathering input respectively; F_v denotes the volcanic flux, and F_{bp} and F_{be} denote the pyrite and evaporite precipitation flux respectively.

We can formulate a similar mass conservation equation for respective isotopes of sulfur (^{32}S and ^{34}S), as in Eq. (2):

$$\frac{d}{dt} M_{SO_4}^{32}(t) = F_{wp}^{32} S(t) - F_{bp}^{32} S(t) + F_{we}^{32} S(t) + F_v^{32} S - F_{be}^{32} S \quad (2)$$

where $M_{SO_4}^{32}$ denotes mass of ^{32}S in the ocean calculated from known mass of sulfate and its isotopic composition; $F_{wp}^{32} S$ and $F_{bp}^{32} S$ denote ^{32}S input from pyrite weathering and ^{32}S removal by pyrite burial respectively; $F_v^{32} S$ denotes the ^{32}S input from volcanic flux; $F_{we}^{32} S$ and $F_{be}^{32} S$ denote the ^{32}S input from evaporite weathering and removal by evaporite precipitation respectively.

In order to achieve an initial steady state we use modern values for the sulfur isotope composition and volume of the fluxes as boundary conditions (e.g., Berner, 1982; Kump, 1989; Hansen and Wallmann, 2003; Bottrell and Newton, 2006; see Table 1. for additional details). Note that the average isotopic composition of buried pyrite ($\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{pyrite}}$) is calculated so that other fluxes are in steady state.

From steady state condition:

$$\frac{d}{dt} M_{SO_4}(t) = 0 \quad (3)$$

we can calculate the average $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{pyrite}}$ value using Eq. (4) and Eq. (5):

$$F_{bp}(t) = F_{bp}^{32} S(t) + F_{bp}^{34} S(t) \quad (4)$$

$$F_{bp}^{34} S(t) = F_{we}^{34} S(t) + F_{wp}^{34} S(t) + F_v^{34} S - F_{be}^{34} S \quad (5)$$

This yields $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{pyrite}}$ value of -18‰ , which is in agreement with previous estimates (Strauss, 1997; Seal, 2006; Leavitt et al., 2013). This implies the average offset (Δ_{pyr}) between $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{seawater}}$ and $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{pyrite}}$ of -40‰ (VCDT) which is similar to the Cenozoic average (Leavitt et al., 2013).

3.4 Model Forcing

The objective of our model is to evaluate the effect of sea level changes on pyrite burial and weathering on the continental shelf and use these changes to track shelf sediment offloading. This requires that we consider two boxes for pyrite burial/erosion. The first box allows for pyrite burial and erosion in the shelf area as a function of the sea level, whereas the second box describes constant pyrite burial in the deep sea and pyrite erosion on continents. Our

model follows the "rapid recycling" concept (Berner, 1987; see also Halevy et al., 2012) which separates inputs and outputs, to and from young and old sediment sub-reservoirs. This separation of young vs. old is geologically reasonable, because young sediments deposited in the near-shore environments are more likely to be weathered than older sediments (Berner, 1987). The novelty in our approach is that we scale fluxes into and from shelf sediments in proportion to the shelf area, as calculated from the high resolution Quaternary sea level record (Miller et al., 2011).

We assume that up to 90% of the total amount of pyrite is buried in the continental shelf (e.g. Berner, 1982; Canfield et al., 1992; Jørgensen, 1982). In deep water environments, the supply of OM is greatly reduced, and MSR and pyrite burial rates are orders of magnitudes smaller than in the shelf. In a first approximation, we can therefore treat pyrite burial in the deep-water box as constant.

There are, however, caveats to this assumption. Pyrite burial could increase if we: a) increase the delivery of reactive OM to the deep ocean by increasing export production b) introduce anoxic conditions c) move coastal upwelling zones offshore during glaciations d) increase input of reactive iron to deep water environments through glacial erosion, iceberg sediment delivery, etc. Although some researchers argued for increased productivity (e.g. Murray et al., 1993; Filippelli et al., 2007) this is disputed by others (e.g. Nameroff et al., 2004; Francois et al., 1997; Dean et al., 1997). On the other hand, while redox proxies support decreased oxygen levels in some parts of the deep glacial ocean (Francois et al., 1997; Thomson et al., 1990; Mangini et al., 2001; Dean et al., 1997), other areas, specifically continental margins, show the opposite trend (i.e., higher oxygen levels, Ganeshram et al., 2002). Overall, Pleistocene trends of deep sea oxygenation are difficult to assess because they are dependent on several factors including circulation patterns, local productivity and temperature which show a high degree of temporal and spatial variability (e.g., Jaccard et al., 2010; Keeling et al., 2010). The offshore migration of upwelling zones during lowstands may increase burial of organic matter and pyrite in the slope and abyssal regions. However, the overall impact of this migration is likely small, because upwelling areas have a small areal extent, and thus a modest impact on the overall organic carbon burial (<10% Berner 1982, Hedges and Keil, 1995; Hu and Cai, 2011). Furthermore, pyrite burial is often limited in the upwelling zones by the lack of reactive iron (e.g., Morse and Emeis, 1990; Mossmann et al., 1991; Schenau et al., 2002; Brüchert et al., 2003; Suits and Arthur, 2000). The glacial inputs of iron by glacier meltwater and icebergs are likely significantly larger than at present, but most of it is in the form of crystalline iron oxides and silicates (e.g., Poulton and Raiswell, 2002, Raiswell et al., 2006) which react with sulfide on 100ky-1Myr timescales (Canfield et al., 1992; Raiswell and Canfield, 1998). On the other hand, majority of reactive Fe is trapped in fjords/estuaries (85-90%, Raiswell et al. 2006; Schroth et al., 2014) and thus unlikely to significantly contribute to pyrite burial in deep water environments. For the purpose of this model we therefore assume that pyrite burial in abyssal environments can be treated as constant.

Sediment offloading will also introduce pyrite and OM into the abyssal box. However, this redistributed pyrite cannot be counted twice, and thus will not alter the overall pyrite burial. The case for OM is however more complicated, as the additional OM will promote increased MSR. The extent of this OM support of MSR is however less clear as the re-mobilized OM is dominantly refractory in nature.

If sediments are quickly transferred from shelf to abyssal regions (e.g., gravity flows), OM and pyrite in redistributed sediments are highly vulnerable to oxidation due greater oxygen penetration in deep water environments (Colley et al., 1984; Cowie et al., 1995; Thomson et al., 1998; Robinson, 2001). The process will continue until diffusive supply of oxygen is interrupted either through deposition of pelagic sediment or another turbidite layer, which can last few thousand to >10 kyrs (Cowie et al., 1995; Thomson et al., 1998; De Lange, 1998; Robinson, 2001). While we cannot quantify the amount of pyrite oxidized in this manner, we note that it is likely a significant portion of the overall pyrite weathering particularly during glaciations when turbidite events are common (Weaver et al., 2000; Piper and Normark, 2009; Meiburg and Kneller, 2010).

We used the sea level estimates of Miller et al. (2011) to calculate the size of the global shelf area. Sea level variations (Fig. 1A) are often modified by local signals (e.g., gravity, mantle flow, isostatic rebound etc). However, the use of a global mean hypsometric curve (ETOPO5, National Geophysical Data Center, 1988) is likely to average out local signals.

We calculate the shelf area (A_s , see Fig. 1B) as a function of sea level at any given point in time using a model cubic polynomial fit (Eq. 6 - after Bjerrum et al., 2006) of ETOPO5 hypsometric curve (National Geophysical Data Center 1988):

$$A_s = A * (1 - 0.307 * z^3 + 0.624 * z^2 + 0.43 * z + 0.99991) \quad (6)$$

where A is the area of the ocean $\sim 3.6 * 10^{14} \text{ m}^2$ and z corresponds to the sea level (m).

The shelf area is used to force the fluxes affected by sea level change: pyrite and evaporite weathering and pyrite burial. First we divide these fluxes into two boxes. The first box corresponds to constant weathering on continents and constant pyrite burial in continental slope and pelagic environments. The second box represents pyrite and evaporite weathering and pyrite burial on the shelf and varies in proportion to calculated shelf area (Eq. (7) and Eq. (8)). The pyrite weathering flux is calculated as follows:

$$F_{wp} = F_{wp}^o * [1 + \frac{A_{max} - A_s}{A_s}] \quad (7)$$

where A_{max} is the maximum extent of shelf area; F_{wp}^* is the calculated pyrite weathering flux corresponding to shelf change $A_s^o - A_s^*$. F_{wp}^o is the minimum pyrite weathering flux corresponding to maximum shelf extent (A_{max}). We assume F_{wp}^o to be 90% of the steady state value calculated for the modern conditions. This assumption is based on the estimates of maximum shelf flooding area in the past 3Ma. During times of maximum flooding the sea level may have been up to 10m higher than the current sea level (Miller et al., 2011),

corresponding to a 10% larger shelf area. At present some pyrite weathering takes place on this previously inundated shelf area. Therefore, we assume that during times of maximum extent of shelf inundation, pyrite weathering was lower and only 90% of today, because pyrite rich shelf sediments were flooded.

Since shelf environments also contain large deposits of evaporites (e.g., Warren, 2006&2010), shelf area variations across glacial-interglacial cycles also affect evaporite weathering. Here we assume that evaporite and pyrite weathering covary and as a result of this the sulfur isotopic composition of sulfate input is steady at ~5.6‰ VCDT, which is in line with present day riverine sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ values and Phanerozoic estimates (on average 3-8‰ VCDT, Canfield, 2013 and references therein). Evaporite weathering is thus calculated as follows:

$$F_{we} = F_{we}^o * [1 + \frac{A_{max} - A_s}{A_s}] \quad (8)$$

where A_{max} is the maximum extent of shelf area; F_{we}^* is the calculated evaporite weathering flux corresponding to shelf change $A_s^o - A_s^*$, F_{we}^o is the minimum evaporite weathering flux corresponding to maximum shelf extent (A_{max}). We assume that F_{we}^o is 90% of the steady state value.

The pyrite burial flux is calculated as follows (9):

$$F_{bp} = F_{bp-abyssal} + F_{bp-shelf} * \frac{A_s - A_{min}}{A_{max} - A_{min}} \quad (9)$$

where $F_{bp-abyssal}$ corresponds to the minimum pyrite burial which takes place in slope and abyssal environments at minimum shelf extent in this case $0.6 * 10^{12} \text{ molS yr}^{-1}$, $F_{bp-shelf}$ is the portion of pyrite that is buried on the shelf at the maximum shelf extent (A_{max}) assumed to be $1.4 * 10^{12} \text{ molS yr}^{-1}$; A_{min} is the minimum shelf extent. These numbers are based on present day estimates of sulfate reduction rates and pyrite burial in sediments at different water depth (Jørgensen, 1982; Jørgensen and Kasten, 2006; Thullner et al., 2009).

When considering pyrite burial on the shelf, we distinguish between old pyrite and pyrite which can be re-mobilized. The former represents the total shelf storage of pyrite ($\sim 10^{19} \text{ molS}$, Charlson et al., 1992), while the latter corresponds to the pyrite sub-reservoir in offloaded shelf sediments. Hay and Southam (1977) estimate that $5 * 10^{21} \text{ g}$ of shelf sediment was offloaded during Pleistocene. If we take an average concentration of pyrite in pre-Holocene fine grained sediments (0.35 wt% Berner, 1982) this corresponds to a pyrite reservoir of $6 * 10^{17} \text{ mol S}$. However, this estimate carries a potentially large error. Although modern observations suggest that pyrite is quickly oxidized in reworked shelf sediments (e.g., Amazon shelf, Aller et al., 1986), it is unclear if all of this eroded pyrite was oxidized. Furthermore, the measured content of pyrite sulfur in shelf sediments is highly variable (0.1-1.5 wt%, Berner, 1982). Therefore, we suggest that pyrite sub-reservoir in offloaded sediments could be $6 * 10^{17} \pm 3 * 10^{17} \text{ mol S}$ and we use this range in model runs.

The average isotopic composition of pyrite across glacial-interglacial periods is not known. Sulfur isotope fractionation is negatively correlated with sedimentation rate (e.g., Goldhaber and Kaplan, 1975), and the recent work by Leavitt et al., (2013) has identified a negative correlation between $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{pyrite}}$ value and shelf area. Since shelf area has changed dramatically across glacial-interglacial cycles it is likely that the offset (Δ_{pyr}) between $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{seawater}}$ and $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{pyrite}}$ values has also changed. Here we calculate variable Δ_{pyr} as follows (10):

$$\Delta_{\text{pyr}} = -50 + 15 * \frac{A_s - A_{\min}}{A_{\max} - A_{\min}} \quad (10)$$

where A_s is shelf area at any given time, A_{\max} and A_{\min} are the maximum and minimum extent of shelf area, respectively. This gives Δ_{pyr} of -50‰ for the most severe glaciations (lowest shelf extent) and -35‰ for the maximum shelf inundation, which is in line with Leavitt et al. (2013) Δ_{pyr} range of estimates for the past 200 Myr.

To test the impact of these temporal variations of Δ_{pyr} we also run our model with “fixed” Δ_{pyr} of -40‰ (our steady state value).

3.5 Sensitivity analysis

The inputs and outputs in the sulfur cycle are not well constrained (Bottrell and Newton, 2006). Estimates for modern pyrite burial vary between 30-90% of the total sulfur burial with the remainder being buried as gypsum or anhydrite (e.g., Canfield, 2004; Kampschulte and Strauss, 2004; Halevy et al., 2012; Canfield, 2013; Tostevin et al., 2014). Similarly, the average sulfur isotopic composition of recently precipitated pyrite is thought to be between -40 and -10‰ (VCDT) (Strauss, 1997; Johnston et al., 2008).

Also note that the burial of organic sulfur is poorly constrained (Werne et al., 2004). Although, it is generally considered to be minor compared to pyrite burial (e.g., Goldhaber, 2003; Werne et al., 2004), in some environments (e.g. Peru shelf, the Miocene Monterey Formation, marine sapropels) it is the dominant form of reduced solid sulfur compounds (e.g., Mossman et al., 1991; Canfield et al., 1998; Suits and Arthur, 2000).

Although the estimates of the respective sulfur fluxes and their isotopic composition vary considerably, the S-isotope record of the ~40-50Ma prior to Quaternary is essentially stable (Paytan et al., 1998). This implies that the sulfur inputs and outputs must have been in isotopic balance, irrespective of their actual magnitude (Kurtz et al., 2003). To evaluate whether our model is sensitive to uncertainties in flux estimates we run model experiments assuming twice and half the flux estimates used above (see Table 1) and using the same forcing. For each setup, we run our model twice: first time with “fixed” Δ_{pyr} of -40‰ (our steady state value) and then with variable Δ_{pyr} .

4 Results and Discussion

The $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value of seawater sulfate is uniform throughout the ocean reflecting the long residence time of marine sulfate (10^7 yr, Jørgensen and Kasten, 2006) compared to the ocean mixing time (1600 yrs). The evolution of the $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value of sulfate thus serves as a proxy for past changes in the sulfur cycle (Paytan et al., 1998&2004; Wortmann and Chernyavsky, 2007; Wortmann and Paytan, 2012).

Our results show that between 3Ma and ~1.5Ma the seawater $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{SO}_4}$ values fluctuate around ~22‰ (VCDT) with a standard deviation (1σ) of 0.2‰. In the interval between 1.5Ma and 0.7Ma we observe a steady decline from ~22‰ (VCDT) to 20.7‰ (VCDT) (Fig. 2). This minimum is followed by an upwards trend from 20.7‰ (VCDT) at 0.7Ma to 21.1‰ (VCDT) at 0.6Ma. In the past 0.3Ma there is a decline from 21.1‰ (VCDT) to ~20.7‰ (VCDT) in the most recent sediments (Fig. 2, see Table A1 in Appendix for full list of samples).

4.1 Causes of seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ change

Considering the long residence time of sulfate in the ocean (10^7 yr, Jørgensen and Kasten, 2006), a -1‰ shift between 1.5Ma and 0.7Ma, implies a massive change in the balance of the sulfur input/output fluxes. Possible explanations include: a) an order of magnitude increase of volcanic and hydrothermal S release; b) a drastic increase in pyrite weathering; c) a massive decrease in pyrite burial. An order of magnitude increase of volcanic S-input is incompatible with the geological record which shows no evidence for intensification of volcanic activity in the Pleistocene compared to the earlier periods of the Cenozoic (Kaiho and Saito, 1994; Mason et al., 2004; Cogné and Humler, 2006; White et al., 2006).

Pyrite weathering could have been affected by changes in continental erosion rates in the past 3Ma (e.g., Raymo et al., 1988). However, recent evidence suggests that these changes were minor (e.g., Foster and Vance, 2006). Nonetheless, pyrite weathering is not restricted to the continental interiors, but happens each time marine sediments are exposed to erosion.

Glacially induced sealevel drops will expose large swaths of previously ocean covered shelf areas to subaerial weathering and erosion. Coincidentally, the shallow shelf is also the location of the highest pyrite burial rates (Jørgensen, 1982). First order approximations show that shelf area related changes in pyrite burial/weathering rates are indeed large enough to explain the observed variations in the marine sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value.

In this context, it is interesting to note that the timing of the $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value shift roughly coincides with increasing amplitude and decreasing frequency of glacial-interglacial cycles (Lisiecki and Raymo, 2005; Clark et al., 2006). In this period the gradual increase in ice volume during glaciations resulted in larger sea level fluctuations (up to 150m, Fig. 1A, Miller et al., 2011) exposing vast areas of continental shelf to weathering and erosion which previously remained fully marine for tens of millions of years (Clark et al., 2006).

1 In the following we use a box model to investigate the hypothesis that the changes in the $\delta^{34}\text{S}$
2 value of marine sulfate are driven by changes in pyrite burial and weathering in the shelf area.

3 We first calculate the ocean covered shelf area as a function of sea level using the sealevel
4 estimates by Miller et al. (2011). In a subsequent step we calculate burial/weathering fluxes as
5 a function of shelf area (see Methods section for a detailed description). For example, if sea
6 level drops by e.g., 100m (typical for the glaciations in the past 1Ma, see Miller et al., 2011)
7 the shelf area is reduced by 50%. The exposure and erosion of previously inundated shelf,
8 results in the oxidation of sulfide minerals (i.e., pyrite), which increases pyrite weathering
9 from $1.5 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ mol S yr}^{-1}$ at steady state to $2.8 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ mol S yr}^{-1}$. At the same time, pyrite burial
10 decreases from $1.6 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ mol S yr}^{-1}$ to $0.8 \cdot 10^{12} \text{ mol S yr}^{-1}$ (for model forcing see Figures 2 and
11 also A4-A5 for sensitivity runs).

12 Increased pyrite weathering during low stands depletes shelf pyrite sub-reservoir, which we
13 estimate to be $6 \cdot 10^{17} \pm 3 \cdot 10^{17} \text{ mol S}$ (see Methods). We run sensitivity analysis to determine
14 how model output changes in this region of shelf pyrite sub-reservoir input parameter
15 uncertainty.

16 Although the recent work by Leavitt et al. (2013) suggests that Δ_{pyr} increases with decreasing
17 shelf area and vice versa on time scales of 10^7 - 10^9 yrs, the glacial-interglacial variations are
18 not constrained. Due to long residence time of sulfate (10^7 yr) it is unclear if Δ_{pyr} changes on
19 this time scale, affect seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$. We explore the impact of Δ_{pyr} temporal variations
20 by comparing model outputs produced assuming “fixed” Δ_{pyr} (-40‰) or variable Δ_{pyr} ,
21 calculated in inverse proportion to the shelf area and within the range of Phanerozoic
22 estimates in Leavitt et al. (2013) (see Methods for details and Fig. 4 for variable Δ_{pyr}).

23 We start our model at 3 Ma (Late Pliocene) and forward the resulting sulfur isotopic
24 composition of seawater sulfate as a function of the sea level estimates published by Miller et
25 al. (2011). Our model captures the shape and magnitude of the $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ signal quite well (Fig. 5).
26 Specifically, the decline of $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ values in the past 1.5 Myr is well represented. This suggests
27 that during this time interval, larger sea level fluctuation of up to -150m (Lisiecki and Raymo
28 2005; Clark et al., 2006; Miller et al., 2011) drastically increased the transfer of shelf
29 sediments into the deep ocean.

30 During the interglacial periods, sea level rise creates large accommodation volumes, but Hay
31 and Southam (1977) proposed that the creation of accommodation space outstripped sediment
32 supply, resulting in a net loss of $5 \cdot 10^{21} \text{ g}$ of shelf sediment during Quaternary. This
33 interpretation is supported by our $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ data, which suggest that the balance between pyrite
34 weathering and pyrite burial shifts in favor of pyrite weathering with increasing sea level
35 variations during Middle Pleistocene.

36 The cumulative pyrite weathering is, however, constrained by variations of seawater sulfate
37 $\delta^{34}\text{S}$. Interestingly, the steady decline of the $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ isotope values appears to slow down or to
38 stop around ~700ka (Fig. 2). If we accept the premise that the pyrite burial and weathering are

linked to sedimentation and subaerial shelf erosion, the stabilization of seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ implies that sediment offloading has come to an end, or in other words, shelf sedimentation and erosion dynamics must have reached a new equilibrium, adapted to the climate driven 100ky sea level cycles.

The model output is affected by the initial size of pyrite shelf sub-reservoir (Fig. 5). The mean estimate for pyrite sub-reservoir parameter ($6 \cdot 10^{17}$ mol S) produces model output within 95% confidence interval of $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ data. Assuming the low estimate of $3 \cdot 10^{17}$ mol S, the model output undershoots the data because shelf pyrite sub-reservoir is quickly depleted (Fig. 5). On the other hand, if we use the higher shelf pyrite sub-reservoir estimate ($9 \cdot 10^{17}$ mol S), the model output exceeds measured seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ drop (Fig. 5).

The model outputs are almost identical whether we use "fixed" or variable Δ_{pyr} , which suggests that our model is not sensitive to changes of Δ_{pyr} (see Fig. 5). This is corroborated by sensitivity test involving only variable Δ_{pyr} , which produced constant output with a small positive shift in the past 1 Myr (Fig. A1). However, we are not arguing that Δ_{pyr} was constant throughout Quaternary. Environmental factors controlling Δ_{pyr} (sedimentation rate, areal extent of shelf environments, Leavitt et al., 2013) have changed during this period, which caused both increase and decrease of Δ_{pyr} . For example, during interglacials Δ_{pyr} could have been -35‰, while during glacials it could have fallen to -50‰ (see Fig. 4). Since Δ_{pyr} fluctuated in both directions, the average for the whole of Quaternary was similar to our "fixed" value of -40‰. While better temporal understanding of Δ_{pyr} variations during Quaternary would certainly improve our interpretation, it is unlikely that Δ_{pyr} controlled seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$.

In our model, we consider pyrite burial in abyssal regions as constant across glacial-interglacial cycles. However, this may not be the case, as pyrite burial during glaciations can be affected by increased OM burial, emergence of bottom water anoxia, migration of upwelling zones or by higher iron input (see Section 3.4 for more details). Higher pyrite burial during glacial periods, for any of these reasons, would have to be compensated by increased pyrite weathering. While this cannot be completely excluded, we note that the change of seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value due to glacial-interglacial variations of pyrite burial alone is ~30% of the overall $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ shift (Fig. A2 in Appendix). Since pyrite burial in deep ocean is small (~10% of the overall pyrite burial, Berner, 1982; Canfield et al., 1992; Jørgensen, 1982) any change of this sink would likely have a minor impact on seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value. Therefore, it is unlikely that increased pyrite burial in the abyssal plain significantly counteracted the effect of sediment offloading.

Sensitivity model runs assuming initial fluxes at twice and half the steady state values show first order agreement with $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ data in the past 2Ma, which supports our argument that shelf area variations during Quaternary control seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ through associated impacts on

pyrite weathering and burial. However, the selection of initial fluxes and pyrite shelf sub-reservoir affects the shape of the resulting model output (Figure A3 in Appendix).

Sensitivity runs assuming initial fluxes at half steady state lag behind the isotope record and undershoot $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ data regardless of the size of the shelf pyrite sub-reservoir (Figure A3a,b, for forcing see A4). These damped model outputs are consistent with a traditional view of the sulfur cycle, which underlines that large and sluggish seawater sulfate reservoir changes slowly in response to the long term changes of small sulfur fluxes (e.g. Kurtz et al., 2003). While this standpoint is valid for long term changes of seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ (10-100Myrs time scales), it is inconsistent with the short term variations ($< 1\text{Myr}$ to 5Myr) (e.g. Kurtz et al., 2003; Wortmann and Chernyavsky, 2007; Wortmann and Paytan, 2012; Halevy et al., 2012). During these short intervals, large increase of sulfate inputs and outputs significantly exceeds long term average values. Since our $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ record also suggests massive short term imbalance between sulfur inputs and outputs, we argue that the initial fluxes at half the steady state value, although conceivable, are likely not representative of the Quaternary sulfur cycle.

The model runs assuming initial fluxes at twice the steady state values fall within 95% confidence interval of $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ data, if we assume the shelf pyrite sub-reservoir of 9×10^{17} mol S and undershoot the data with shelf pyrite sub-reservoir of 3×10^{17} mol S (see Figures A3c,d). The fluxes calculated in these sensitivity runs are at the higher end of previously published values (Fig. A5; for comparison with similar fluxes see estimate of glacial pyrite weathering in Turchyn and Schrag, 2004). Therefore, we posit that they constrain the upper limit of shelf pyrite sub-reservoir which is approximately 9×10^{17} mol S. Together with our main model run (see Fig. 3 and Fig. 5) this suggests that glacial shelf sediment erosion resulted in oxidation between 6×10^{17} and 9×10^{17} mol of pyrite S during Quaternary.

4.2 Pyrite oxidation and the carbon cycle

A massive increase of pyrite weathering implied by our results has important implications on the carbon cycle. Namely, pyrite weathering produces very strong sulfuric acid which dissolves carbonates (e.g., Spence and Telmer, 2005; Calmels et al., 2007). Since continental shelf sediments are rich in carbonates (de Haas et al., 2002) the production of sulfuric acid is likely balanced by carbonate dissolution, which delivers dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) into the ocean-atmosphere system. Per each mole of sulfate two moles of DIC are transferred to the ocean (Torres et al., 2014) (Reaction R1).



Therefore pyrite weathering effectively increases dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) storage in the ocean (Torres et al., 2014). If integrated over the entire period of the $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value shift, pyrite oxidation results in a net transfer of 14000-21000PgC or about a third to a half of deep ocean DIC storage.

5 Conclusion

This study shows that the intensification of Quaternary glaciations in the past 1.5Ma and concomitant periodic changes in shelf area, likely affected the balance of weathering fluxes of sulfate/sulfide and the burial of pyrite. We propose that during glacial periods, pyrite weathering drastically increases as a result of subaerial shelf erosion and that the increased erosion rates are not fully compensated by increased pyrite burial during sealevel high stands.

The declining seawater $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ values support the idea that the transition to the climate driven 100kyr sea level variations resulted in a net reduction of shelf sediment volume (i.e., the so called “shelf sediment offloading”, Hay and Southam, 1977).

Our data show that the steady decline in the seawater $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ values stops around 700ka. We consider it likely that this stabilization indicates the termination of the massive net “sediment offloading” (Hay and Southam, 1977), and heralds a new equilibrium between shelf erosion during sea level lowstands and sediment resupply during sea level high stands.

The resuspension of previously deposited sediments oxidized large amounts of pyrite back to sulfate. Our model results suggest that this would have increased the marine sulfate concentration by ~1-3 mM in good agreement with sulfate concentration estimates based on fluid inclusions (Brennan et al., 2013) and estimates of the ocean alkalinity based on boron isotopes (Hoenisch et al., 2009). Further, it is likely that shelf sediment offloading may have impacted additional elements that are predominantly buried in the shelf sediments such as phosphorus and carbon (e.g., Berner, 1982; Wollast, 1991; Ruttenger, 2003) with possible implications to their biogeochemical cycles as well as ocean productivity.

1 Appendix: Sample list, model results and forcing of sensitivity runs

2 Table A1. Sample list with sulfur isotope results

Leg	Site	Hole	Core	Section	Top(cm)	Bottom(cm)	Depth(mbsf)	Age [Ma]	$\delta^{34}\text{S}$ [‰]
138	851	B	1	1	41	42	0.41	0.020	20.7
138	851	B	1	1	55	57	0.55	0.026	20.7
138	851	B	1	1	106	108	1.06	0.049	20.6
138	851	B	1	1	146	148	1.46	0.066	20.7
138	851	B	1	2	17	19	1.67	0.078	20.8
138	851	B	1	2	137	139	2.87	0.158	20.7
138	851	B	1	2	147	149	2.97	0.170	20.8
138	851	B	1	3	8	10	3.08	0.178	21.0
138	851	B	1	3	33	35	3.33	0.193	20.9
138	851	B	1	3	101	103	4.01	0.240	21.1
138	849	B	2	1	100	104	7.70	0.305	20.9
138	849	B	2	3	42	46	10.12	0.375	20.8
138	851	B	1	5	85	90	6.85	0.418	21.1
138	849	B	2	5	5	10	12.75	0.475	20.8
138	851	B	2	1	75	80	8.25	0.528	21.1
138	851	B	2	2	22	24	9.22	0.609	21.1
138	851	B	2	2	22	24	9.22	0.609	20.9
138	851	B	2	2	34	36	9.34	0.619	20.9
138	851	B	2	2	130	132	10.3	0.659	20.9
138	851	B	2	2	144	146	10.44	0.665	20.9
138	851	B	2	3	48	50	10.98	0.686	20.7
138	851	B	2	3	48	50	10.98	0.686	21.0
138	851	B	2	3	56	58	11.06	0.689	20.9
138	851	B	2	3	104	106	11.54	0.705	21.0
138	851	B	2	3	144	146	11.94	0.720	21.1
138	851	B	2	4	18	20	12.18	0.736	20.9
138	851	B	2	4	66	68	12.66	0.765	21.1
138	851	B	2	4	84	86	12.84	0.776	21.1
138	851	B	2	4	116	118	13.16	0.795	21.2
138	851	B	2	4	138	140	13.38	0.808	21.3
138	851	B	2	4	146	148	13.46	0.815	21.3
138	851	B	2	5	13	15	13.63	0.828	21.3
138	851	B	2	5	56	58	14.06	0.852	21.4
138	851	B	2	6	38	40	15.38	0.915	21.3
138	851	B	2	6	49	51	15.49	0.922	21.2
138	851	B	2	6	122	124	16.22	0.964	21.2
138	851	B	2	6	145	147	16.45	0.978	21.2
138	851	B	3	1	55	57	17.55	1.124	21.3
138	851	B	3	1	122	124	18.22	1.164	21.4
138	849	D	4	1	54	56	33.04	1.373	21.8
138	851	B	3	4	130	135	22.8	1.401	21.7
138	851	B	3	6	90	95	25.4	1.548	21.8
138	849	D	4	4	68	70	37.68	1.580	21.8
138	851	B	3	7	28	30	26.28	1.607	21.8
138	851	B	4	1	97	99	27.47	1.754	22.0
138	849	C	5	2	103	105	41.53	1.798	21.8
138	849	D	5	3	61	63	45.61	1.928	21.8
138	851	B	4	3	96	98	30.46	1.950	21.9
138	851	B	4	4	75	77	31.75	2.019	22.1
138	851	B	4	5	87	89	33.37	2.102	22.0
138	849	D	6	1	108	110	52.58	2.143	21.9

138	849	D	6	3	63	65	55.13	2.261	21.9 ₁
138	849	D	6	4	108	110	57.08	2.340	22.0
138	849	D	7	5	16	18	67.16	2.736	22.1 ₂
138	849	D	8	1	112	114	71.62	2.976	21.9




Figure A1. Model output using variable Δ_{pyr} . Black solid line – model output produced assuming constant steady state fluxes and variable Δ_{pyr} . Green dashed line – model output produced assuming constant fluxes at 200% steady state values and variable Δ_{pyr} . Brown dashed line – model output produced assuming constant fluxes at 50% steady state values and variable Δ_{pyr} . The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval of a LOESS approximation of the “true” $\delta^{34}S_{SO_4}$ value. Note that the size of pyrite reservoir in these model experiments remains the same because input and output fluxes are kept constant.





Figure 2. Model output with variable pyrite burial and fixed weathering fluxes and Δ_{pyr} . Black solid line – model output produced assuming initial fluxes at steady state values, variable pyrite burial and fixed weathering fluxes and Δ_{pyr} . Green dashed line – model output produced assuming initial fluxes at 200% steady state values, variable pyrite burial and fixed weathering fluxes and Δ_{pyr} . Brown dashed line – model output produced assuming initial fluxes at 50% steady state values, variable pyrite burial, fixed weathering fluxes and Δ_{pyr} . The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval of a LOESS approximation of the “true” $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{SO}_4}$ composition.

1



2

Figure A3. Sensitivity model tests. a) Model output using fixed Δ_{pyr} and assuming initial fluxes at 50% steady state values. b) Model output using variable Δ_{pyr} and assuming initial fluxes at 50% steady state values. c) Model output using fixed Δ_{pyr} and assuming initial fluxes at 200% steady state values. d) Model output using variable Δ_{pyr} and assuming initial fluxes at 200% steady state values. Note: Black solid line - model outputs produced assuming the low estimate for shelf pyrite sub-reservoir. Brown solid line - model outputs produced assuming the high estimate for shelf pyrite sub-reservoir. The shaded area represents the 95% confidence interval of a LOESS approximation of the “true” $\delta^{34}S_{SO_4}$ value (for forcing see Figures A3-A4)


12

13


14

15

16



1 | Figure A4. Model forcing with initial fluxes at 50% steady state values. A) Pyrite weathering
2 | (Fwp) B) Evaporite weathering (Fwe) C) Pyrite burial (Fbp) D) Pyrite sub-reservoir on the
3 | shelf. Note: the pyrite burial flux is not affected by the size of initial pyrite shelf sub-reservoir



11

12 | Figure A5. Model forcing with initial fluxes at 200% steady state values. A) Pyrite weathering
 13 (Fwp) B) Evaporite weathering (Fwe) C) Pyrite burial (Fbp) D) Pyrite sub-reservoir on the
 14 shelf. Note: the pyrite burial flux is not affected by the size of pyrite shelf sub-reservoir

15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23

1

2 **Acknowledgements**

3 We thank B. Brunner and B. Wing for discussions and comments on an early draft of this
4 manuscript and Hong Li for help with isotope analyses. Additionally, we thank P. Meister, B.
5 Mayer and one anonymous reviewer on constructive review, which greatly improved the
6 quality of this paper. This project was supported by a NSERC discovery grant to UGW.

1 **References**

- 2 Aller, R. C., Mackin, J. E., and Cox, R. T.: Diagenesis Of Fe And S In Amazon Inner Shelf
3 Muds - Apparent Dominance Of Fe Reduction And Implications For The Genesis Of
4 Ironstones, *Continental Shelf Research*, 6, 263-289, 10.1016/0278-4343(86)90064-6, 1986.
- 5 Berner, R. A.: Burial Of Organic-Carbon And Pyrite Sulfur In The Modern Ocean - Its
6 Geochemical And Environmental Significance, *American Journal of Science*, 282, 451-473,
7 1982.
- 8 Berner, R. A.: Models For Carbon And Sulfur Cycles And Atmospheric Oxygen - Application
9 To Paleozoic Geologic History, *American Journal of Science*, 287, 177-196, 1987.
- 10 Bjerrum, C. J., Bendtsen, J., and Legarth, J. J. F.: Modeling organic carbon burial during sea
11 level rise with reference to the Cretaceous, *Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems*, 7, 1-24,
12 10.1029/2005gc001032, 2006.
- 13 Böttcher, M. E., Thamdrup, B., and Vennemann, T. W.: Oxygen and sulfur isotope
14 fractionation during anaerobic bacterial disproportionation of elemental sulfur, *Geochimica Et*
15 *Cosmochimica Acta*, 65, 1601-1609, 10.1016/s0016-7037(00)00628-1, 2001.
- 16 Böttcher, M. E., Thamdrup, B., Gehre, M., and Theune, A.: S-34/S-32 and O-18/O-16
17 fractionation during sulfur disproportionation by *Desulfobulbus propionicus*,
18 *Geomicrobiology Journal*, 22, 219-226, 10.1080/01490450590947751, 2005.
- 19 Bottrell, S. H., and Newton, R. J.: Reconstruction of changes in global sulfur cycling from
20 marine sulfate isotopes, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 75, 59-83, 10.1016/j.earscirev.2005.10.004,
21 2006.
- 22 Breit, G. N., Simmons, E. C., and Goldhaber, M. B.: Dissolution Of Barite For The Analysis
23 Of Strontium Isotopes And Other Chemical And Isotopic Variations Using Aqueous Sodium-
24 Carbonate, *Chemical Geology*, 52, 333-336, 10.1016/0168-9622(85)90043-0, 1985.
- 25 Brennan, S. T., Lowenstein, T. K., and Cendon, D. I.: The Major-Ion Composition Of
26 Cenozoic Seawater: The Past 36 Million Years From Fluid Inclusions In Marine Halite,
27 *American Journal of Science*, 313, 713-775, 10.2475/08.2013.01, 2013.

1 Brunner, B., and Bernasconi, S. M.: A revised isotope fractionation model for dissimilatory
2 sulfate reduction in sulfate reducing bacteria, *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta*, 69, 4759-
3 4771, 10.1016/j.gca.2005.04.015, 2005.

4 Brüchert, V., Jørgensen, B. B., Neumann, K., Riechmann, D., Schlösser, M. and Schulz, H.:
5 Regulation of bacterial sulfate reduction and hydrogen sulfide fluxes in the central Namibian
6 coastal upwelling zone, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 67, 4505–4518, doi:10.1016/S0016-
7 7037(03)00275-8, 2003.

8 Calmels, D., Gaillardet, J., Brenot, A., and France-Lanord, C.: Sustained sulfide oxidation by
9 physical erosion processes in the Mackenzie River basin: Climatic perspectives, *Geology*, 35,
10 1003-1006, 10.1130/g24132a.1, 2007.

11 Canfield, D. E., Raiswell, R., and Bottrell, S.: The Reactivity Of Sedimentary Iron Minerals
12 Toward Sulfide, *American Journal of Science*, 292, 659-683, 1992.

13 Canfield, D. E.: The evolution of the Earth surface sulfur reservoir, *American Journal of*
14 *Science*, 304, 839-861, 10.2475/ajs.304.10.839, 2004.

15 Canfield, D. E.: Sulfur isotopes in coal constrain the evolution of the Phanerozoic sulfur cycle,
16 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 110, 8443-
17 8446, 10.1073/pnas.1306450110, 2013.

18 Canfield, D. E., and Thamdrup, B.: The production of ³⁴S-depleted sulfide during bacterial
19 disproportionation of elemental sulfur, *Science*, 266,1973-1975, 1994.

20 Canheld, D. E., Boudreau, B. P., Mucci, A. and Gundersen, J. K.: The early diagenetic
21 formation of organic sulfur in the sediments of Mangrove Lake, Bermuda, *Geochim.*
22 *Cosmochim. Acta*, 62, 767–781, doi:10.1016/S0016-7037(98)00032-5, 1998.

23 Charlson, R. J., Anderson, T. L., and McDuff, R. E.: The sulfur cycle, *International*
24 *Geophysics Series*; Global biogeochemical cycles, 50, 285-300, 1992.

25 Clark, P. U., Archer, D., Pollard, D., Blum, J. D., Rial, J. A., Brovkin, V., Mix, A. C., Pisias, N.
26 G., and Roy, M.: The middle Pleistocene transition: characteristics. mechanisms, and
27 implications for long-term changes in atmospheric PCO₂, *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 25,
28 3150-3184, 10.1016/j.quascirev.2006.07.008, 2006.

- 1 Claypool, G. E., Holser, W. T., Kaplan, I. R., Sakai, H., and Zak, I.: The Age Curves Of Sulfur
2 And Oxygen Isotopes In Marine Sulfate And Their Mutual Interpretation, *Chemical Geology*,
3 28, 199-230, 10.1016/0009-2541(80)90047-9, 1980.
- 4 Cleveland, W. S.: Robust Locally Weighted Regression and Smoothing Scatterplots, *Journal*
5 *of the American Statistical Association* 74, 829–836, 1979.
- 6 Cogné, J. P., and Humler, E.: Trends and rhythms in global seafloor generation rate,
7 *Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems*, 7, Q03011, 10.1029/2005gc001148, 2006.
- 8 Colley, S., Thomson, J., Wilson, T. R. . and Higgs, N. .: Post-depositional migration of
9 elements during diagenesis in brown clay and turbidite sequences in the North East Atlantic,
10 *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 48, 1223–1235, doi:10.1016/0016-7037(84)90057-7, 1984.
- 11 Coplen, T.B., Hopple, J.A., Böhlke, J.K., Peiser, H.S., Rieder, S.E., Krouse, H.R., Rosman,
12 K.J.R., Ding, T., Vocke, Jr., R.D., Révész, K.M., Lamberty, A., Taylor, P., and De Bièvre, P.,
13 *Compilation of minimum and maximum isotope ratios of selected elements in naturally*
14 *occurring terrestrial materials and reagents*, U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources
15 *Investigations Report* 01-4222, 2001.
- 16 Cowie and G: Elemental and major biochemical changes across an oxidation front in a relict
17 turbidite: An oxygen effect, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, 59, 33–46, doi:10.1016/0016-
18 0379(40)0329K-, 1995.
- 19 de Haas, H., van Weering, T. C. E., and de Stieger, H.: Organic carbon in shelf seas: sinks or
20 sources, processes and products, *Continental Shelf Research*, 22, 691-717, 10.1016/s0278-
21 4343(01)00093-0, 2002.
- 22 De Lange, G. J.: Oxic vs. anoxic diagenetic alteration of turbidite sediments in the Madeira
23 Abyssal Plain, eastern North Atlantic, in Weaver, Schmincke, Firth and Duffield (Eds.):
24 *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Scientific Results*, vol. 157, pp. 573–579., 1998.
- 25 Dean, W. E., Gardner, J. V., and Piper, D. Z.: Inorganic geochemical indicators of glacial-
26 interglacial changes in productivity and anoxia on the California continental margin,
27 *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta*, 61, 4507-4518, 10.1016/s0016-7037(97)00237-8, 1997.

1 DeBond, N., Oakes, R. L., Paytan, A., and Wortmann, U. G.: Early Aptian carbon and sulphur
2 isotope signatures at ODP Site 765, *Isotopes in Environmental and Health Studies*, 48, 180-
3 194, 10.1080/10256016.2012.659732, 2012.

4 Filippelli, G. M., Latimer, J. C., Murray, R. W., and Flores, J.-A.: Productivity records from
5 the Southern Ocean and the equatorial Pacific Ocean: Testing the glacial Shelf-Nutrient
6 Hypothesis, *Deep-Sea Research Part II-Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 54, 2443-2452,
7 10.1016/j.dsr2.2007.07.021, 2007.

8 Foster, G. L., and Vance, D.: Negligible glacial-interglacial variation in continental chemical
9 weathering rates, *Nature*, 444, 918-921, 10.1038/nature05365, 2006.

10 Francois, R., and Bacon, M. P.: Geochemical archives encoded in deep-sea sediments offer
11 clues for reconstructing the ocean's role in past climatic changes, *Oceanus*, 40, 29-32, 1997.

12 Ganeshram, R. S., Pedersen, T. F., Calvert, S. E., and Francois, R.: Reduced nitrogen fixation
13 in the glacial ocean inferred from changes in marine nitrogen and phosphorus inventories,
14 *Nature*, 415, 156-159, 10.1038/415156a, 2002.

15 Garrels, R. M., and Lerman, A.: Phanerozoic Cycles Of Sedimentary Carbon And Sulfur,
16 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America-Physical*
17 *Sciences*, 78, 4652-4656, 10.1073/pnas.78.8.4652, 1981.

18 Gibbs, M. T., and Kump, L. R.: Global Chemical Erosion During The Last Glacial Maximum
19 And The Present - Sensitivity To Changes In Lithology And Hydrology, *Paleoceanography*, 9,
20 529-543, 10.1029/94pa01009, 1994.

21 Goldhaber, M. B., and Kaplan, I. R.: Controls And Consequences Of Sulfate Reduction Rates
22 In Recent Marine Sediments, *Soil Science*, 119, 42-55, 10.1097/00010694-197501000-00008,
23 1975.

24 Goldhaber, M.: Sulfur-rich sediments, *Treatise on Geochemistry*, 254-288, doi:10.1016/B0-
25 08-043751-6/07139-5, 2003.

26 Griffith, E. M., and Paytan, A.: Barite in the ocean - occurrence, geochemistry and
27 palaeoceanographic applications, *Sedimentology*, 59, 1817-1835, 10.1111/j.1365-
28 3091.2012.01327.x, 2012.

- 1 Halevy, I., Peters, S. E., and Fischer, W. W.: Sulfate Burial Constraints on the Phanerozoic
2 Sulfur Cycle, *Science*, 337, 331-334, 10.1126/science.1220224, 2012.
- 3 Hansen, K. W., and Wallmann, K.: Cretaceous and cenozoic evolution of seawater
4 composition, atmospheric O₂ and CO₂: A model perspective, *American Journal of Science*,
5 303, 94-148, 2003.
- 6 Hay, W.W., and Southam, J.R.: Modulation of sedimentation by the continental shelves, in:
7 The fate of fossil fuel CO₂ in the oceans, Plenum Press, New York, 569-604, 1977.
- 8 Hay, W. W.: Detrital sediment fluxes from continents to oceans, *Chemical Geology*, 145, 287-
9 323, 10.1016/s0009-2541(97)00149-6, 1998.
- 10 Hay, W. W., Soeding, E., DeConto, R. M., and Wold, C. N.: The Late Cenozoic uplift -
11 climate change paradox, *International Journal of Earth Sciences*, 91, 746-774,
12 10.1007/s00531-002-0263-1, 2002.
- 13 Hedges, J. I. and Keil, R. G.: Sedimentary organic matter preservation: an assessment and
14 speculative synthesis, *Mar. Chem.*, 49, 137-139, doi:10.1016/0304-4203(95)00013-H, 1995.
- 15 Hoenisch, B., Hemming, N. G., Archer, D., Siddall, M., and McManus, J. F.: Atmospheric
16 Carbon Dioxide Concentration Across the Mid-Pleistocene Transition, *Science*, 324, 1551-
17 1554, 10.1126/science.1171477, 2009.
- 18 Horita, J., Zimmermann, H., and Holland, H. D.: Chemical evolution of seawater during the
19 Phanerozoic: Implications from the record of marine evaporites, *Geochimica Et*
20 *Cosmochimica Acta*, 66, 3733-3756, 10.1016/s0016-7037(01)00884-5, 2002.
- 21 Hu, X. and Cai, W. J.: An assessment of ocean margin anaerobic processes on oceanic
22 alkalinity budget, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 25, doi:10.1029/2010GB003859, 2011.
- 23 Jaccard, S. L., Galbraith, E. D., Sigman, D. M., and Haug, G. H.: A pervasive link between
24 Antarctic ice core and subarctic Pacific sediment records over the past 800 kyrs, *Quaternary*
25 *Science Reviews*, 29, 206-212, 10.1016/j.quascirev.2009.10.007, 2010.
- 26 Johnston, D. T., Farquhar, J., Habicht, K. S., and Canfield, D. E.: Sulphur isotopes and the
27 search for life: strategies for identifying sulphur metabolisms in the rock record and beyond,
28 *Geobiology*, 6, 425-435, 10.1111/j.1472-4669.2008.00171.x, 2008.

1 Jørgensen, B. B.: Mineralization Of Organic-Matter In The Sea Bed - The Role Of Sulfate
2 Reduction, *Nature*, 296, 643–645, 10.1038/296643a0, 1982.

3 Jørgensen, B. B. and Kasten, S.: *Marine Geochemistry*, chap. Sulfur cycling and methane
4 oxidation, Springer, Berlin, 2nd edn., 271–309, 2006.

5 Kaiho, K., and Saito, S.: Oceanic-Crust Production And Climate During The Last 100-Myr,
6 *Terra Nova*, 6, 376-384, 10.1111/j.1365-3121.1994.tb00510.x, 1994.

7 Kampschulte, A., and Strauss, H.: The sulfur isotopic evolution of Phanerozoic seawater
8 based on the analysis of structurally substituted sulfate in carbonates, *Chemical Geology*, 204,
9 255-286, 10.1016/j.chemgeo.2003.11.013, 2004.

10 Keeling, R. F., Kortzinger, A., and Gruber, N.: Ocean Deoxygenation in a Warming World, in:
11 *Annual Review of Marine Science*, *Annual Review of Marine Science*, Annual Reviews, Palo
12 Alto, 199-229, 2010.

13 Kump, L. R.: Alternative Modeling Approaches To The Geochemical Cycles Of Carbon,
14 Sulfur, And Strontium Isotopes, *American Journal of Science*, 289, 390-410, 1989.

15 Kurtz, A., Kump, L. R., Arthur, M. A., Zachos, J. C., and Paytan, A.: Early Cenozoic
16 decoupling of the global carbon and sulfur cycles, *Paleoceanography*, 18,
17 1090, doi:10.1029/2003PA000908, 2003.

18 Leavitt, W. D., Halevy, I., Bradley, A. S., and Johnston, D. T.: Influence of sulfate reduction
19 rates on the Phanerozoic sulfur isotope record, *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
20 *Sciences of the United States of America*, 110, 11244-11249, 10.1073/pnas.1218874110, 2013.

21 Lisiecki, L. E., and Raymo, M. E.: A Pliocene-Pleistocene stack of 57 globally distributed
22 benthic delta O-18 records, *Paleoceanography*, 20, PA1003, 10.1029/2004pa001071, 2005.

23 Mangini, A., Jung, M., and Laukenmann, S.: What do we learn from peaks of uranium and of
24 manganese in deep sea sediments?, *Marine Geology*, 177, 63-78, 10.1016/s0025-
25 3227(01)00124-4, 2001.

26 Mason, B. G., Pyle, D. M., and Oppenheimer, C.: The size and frequency of the largest
27 explosive eruptions on Earth, *Bulletin of Volcanology*, 66, 735-748, 10.1007/s00445-004-
28 0355-9, 2004.

1 Meiburg, E. and Kneller, B.: Turbidity Currents and Their Deposits, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.*,
2 42, 135–156, doi:10.1146/annurev-fluid-121108-145618, 2010.

3 Miller, K. G., Mountain, G. S., Wright, J. D., and Browning, J. V.: A 180-Million-Year Record
4 of Sea Level and Ice Volume Variations from Continental Margin and Deep-Sea Isotopic
5 Records, *Oceanography*, 24, 40-53, 2011.

6 Morse, J. W. and Emeis, K. C.: Controls on C/S ratios in hemipelagic upwelling sediments,
7 *Am. J. Sci.*, 290, 1117–1135, doi:10.2475/ajs.290.10.1117, 1990.

8 Mossman, J.-R., Aplin, A. C., Curtis, C. D. and Coleman, M. L.: Geochemistry of inorganic
9 and organic sulphur in organic-rich sediments from the Peru Margin, *Geochim. Cosmochim.*
10 *Acta*, 55, 3581–3595, doi:10.1016/0016-7037(91)90057-C, 1991.

11 Murray, R. W., Leinen, M., and Isern, A. R.: Biogenic Flux Of A1 To Sediment In The Central
12 Equatorial Pacific-Ocean - Evidence For Increased Productivity During Glacial Periods,
13 *Paleoceanography*, 8, 651-670, 10.1029/93pa02195, 1993.

14 Nameroff, T. J., Calvert, S. E., and Murray, J. W.: Glacial-interglacial variability in the eastern
15 tropical North Pacific oxygen minimum zone recorded by redox-sensitive trace metals,
16 *Paleoceanography*, 19, PA1010, 10.1029/2003pa000912, 2004.

17 National Geophysical Data Center: ETOPO-5 bathymetry/topography data, Data
18 Announcement 88-MGG-02, Natl.Oceanic and Atmos. Admin., U.S. Dep. of Comm., Boulder,
19 Colo., 1988.

20 Newton, R.J., Reeves, E.P., Kafousia, N., Wignall, P.B., Bottrell, S.H., and Sha, J.,: Low
21 marine sulfate concentrations and the isolation of the European epicontinental sea during the
22 Early Jurassic, *Geology* 39, 7–10, 2011.

23 Paytan, A., Kastner, M., and Chavez, F. P.: Glacial to interglacial fluctuations in productivity
24 in the equatorial Pacific as indicated by marine barite, *Science*, 274, 1355-1357,
25 10.1126/science.274.5291.1355, 1996.

26 Paytan, A., Kastner, M., Campbell, D., and Thiemens, M. H.: Sulfur isotopic composition of
27 Cenozoic seawater sulfate, *Science*, 282, 1459-1462, 10.1126/science.282.5393.1459, 1998.

1 Paytan, A., Mearon, S., Cobb, K. M., and Kastner, M.: Origin of marine barite deposits: Sr
2 and S isotope characterization, *Geology*, 30, 747-750, 10.1130/0091-
3 7613(2002)030<0747:oombds>2.0.co;2, 2002.

4 Paytan, A., Kastner, M., Campbell, D., and Thiemens, M. H.: Seawater sulfur isotope
5 fluctuations in the Cretaceous, *Science*, 304, 1663-1665, 2004.

6 Petsch, S. T., and Berner, R. A.: Coupling the geochemical cycles of C, P, Fe, and S: The
7 effect on atmospheric O₂ and the isotopic records of carbon and sulfur, *American Journal of*
8 *Science*, 298, 246-262, 1998.

9 Piper, D. J. W. and Normark, W. R.: Processes That Initiate Turbidity Currents and Their
10 Influence on Turbidites: A Marine Geology Perspective, *J. Sediment. Res.*, 79, 347–362,
11 doi:10.2110/jsr.2009.046, 2009.

12 Poulton, S. W., and Raiswell, R.: The low-temperature geochemical cycle of iron: From
13 continental fluxes to marine sediment deposition, *American Journal of Science*, 302, 774-805,
14 10.2475/ajs.302.9.774, 2002.

15 Raiswell, R., and Canfield, D. E.: Sources of iron for pyrite formation in marine sediments,
16 *American Journal of Science*, 298, 219-245, 1998.

17 Raiswell, R., Tranter, M., Benning, L. G., Siegert, M., De'ath, R., Huybrechts, P., and Payne,
18 T.: Contributions from glacially derived sediment to the global iron (oxyhydr)oxide cycle:
19 Implications for iron delivery to the oceans, *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta*, 70, 2765-
20 2780, 10.1016/j.gca.2005.12.027, 2006.

21 Raymo, M. E., Ruddiman, W. F., and Froelich, P. N.: Influence Of Late Cenozoic Mountain
22 Building On Ocean Geochemical Cycles, *Geology*, 16, 649-653, 10.1130/0091-
23 7613(1988)016<0649:iolcmb>2.3.co;2, 1988.

24 Robinson, S. G.: Early diagenesis in an organic-rich turbidite and pelagic clay sequence from
25 the Cape Verde Abyssal Plain, NE Atlantic: Magnetic and geochemical signals, *Sediment.*
26 *Geol.*, 143, 91–123, doi:10.1016/S0037-0738(00)00187-1, 2001.

27 R Core Team, R: A language and environment for statistical computing, R
28 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2012.

- 1 Rudnicki, M. D., Elderfield, H., and Spiro, B.: Fractionation of sulfur isotopes during
2 bacterial sulfate reduction in deep ocean sediments at elevated temperatures, *Geochimica Et*
3 *Cosmochimica Acta*, 65, 777-789, 10.1016/s0016-7037(00)00579-2, 2001.
- 4 Ruttenberg, K.C.: The Global Phosphorus Cycle, in: *Treatise on Geochemistry*, 8, Elsevier,
5 Amsterdam, 585–643, 2003.
- 6 Schroth, A. W., Crusius, J., Hoyer, I., and Campbell, R.: Estuarine removal of glacial iron and
7 implications for iron fluxes to the ocean, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 41, 3951-3958,
8 10.1002/2014gl060199, 2014.
- 9 Seal, R. R., II: Sulfur isotope geochemistry of sulfide minerals, *Sulfide Mineralogy and*
10 *Geochemistry*, 61, 633-677, 10.2138/rmg.2006.61.12, 2006.
- 11 Sim, M. S., Bosak, T., and Ono, S.: Large Sulfur Isotope Fractionation Does Not Require
12 Disproportionation, *Science*, 333, 74-77, 10.1126/science.1205103, 2011.
- 13 Shackleton, N.J., Crowhurst, S., Hagelberg, T., Pisias, N.G., and Schneider, D. A.: A new late
14 Neogene time scale: application to Leg 138 sites, in: *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling*
15 *Program, Scientific results*, edited by: Pisias, N. G., Mayer, L.A., Janecek, T. R., Palmer-
16 Julson, A., and van Andel, T. H., ODP, Ocean Drilling program, College Station, TX, 138, 73–
17 101, [doi:10.2973/odp.proc.sr.138.106.1995](https://doi.org/10.2973/odp.proc.sr.138.106.1995), 1995.
- 18 Schenau, S. J., Passier, H. F., Reichert, G. J. and De Lange, G. J.: Sedimentary pyrite
19 formation in the Arabian Sea, *Mar. Geol.*, 185, 393–402, doi:10.1016/S0025-3227(02)00183-
20 4, 2002.
- 21 Suits, N. S. and Arthur, M. A.: Sulfur diagenesis and partitioning in Holocene Peru shelf and
22 upper slope sediments, *Chem. Geol.*, 163, 219–234, doi:10.1016/S0009-2541(99)00114-X,
23 2000.
- 24 Shipboard Scientific Party: Site 849, *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program*, in:
25 *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Initial Reports*, edited by: Mayer, L., Pisias, N.,
26 Janecek, T.R.; Palmer-Julson, A., van Andel, T.H., ODP, Ocean Drilling program, College
27 Station, TX, 138, 735–807, [doi:10.2973/odp.proc.ir.138.114.1992](https://doi.org/10.2973/odp.proc.ir.138.114.1992), 1992a.

1 Shipboard Scientific Party: Site 851, Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, in:
2 Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling Program, Initial Reports, edited by: Mayer, L., Pisias, N.,
3 Janecek, T.R.; Palmer-Julson, A., van Andel, T.H., ODP, Ocean Drilling program, College
4 Station, TX, 138, 891–965, [doi:10.2973/odp.proc.ir.138.116.1992](https://doi.org/10.2973/odp.proc.ir.138.116.1992), 1992b.

5 Spence, J., and Telmer, K.: The role of sulfur in chemical weathering and atmospheric CO₂
6 fluxes: Evidence from major ions, delta C-13(DIC), and delta S-34(SO₄) in rivers of the
7 Canadian Cordillera, *Geochimica Et Cosmochimica Acta*, 69, 5441-5458,
8 10.1016/j.gca.2005.07.011, 2005.

9 Strauss, H.: The isotopic composition of sedimentary sulfur through time, *Palaeogeography*
10 *Palaeoclimatology Palaeoecology*, 132, 97-118, 10.1016/s0031-0182(97)00067-9, 1997.

11 Thomson, J., Wallace, H. E., Colley, S., and Toole, J.: Authigenic Uranium In Atlantic
12 Sediments Of The Last Glacial Stage - A Diagenetic Phenomenon, *Earth and Planetary*
13 *Science Letters*, 98, 222-232, 10.1016/0012-821x(90)90061-2, 1990.

14 Thomson, J., Jarvis, I., Green, D. R. H. and Green, D.: Oxidation fronts in Madeira abyssal
15 plain turbidites: Persistence of early diagenetic trace-element enrichments during burial, site
16 950, in Weaver, Schmincke, Firth and Duffield (Eds.): *Proceedings of the Ocean Drilling*
17 *Program, Scientific Results*, vol. 157, pp. 559–571, Ocean Drilling Program.

18 Thullner, M., Dale, A. W., and Regnier, P.: Global-scale quantification of mineralization
19 pathways in marine sediments: A reaction-transport modeling approach, *Geochemistry*
20 *Geophysics Geosystems*, 10, Q10012, 10.1029/2009gc002484, 2009.

21 Torres, M. A., West, A. J., and Li, G.: Sulphide oxidation and carbonate dissolution as a
22 source of CO₂ over geological timescales, *Nature*, 507, 346–349, 10.1038/nature13030, 2014.

23 Torres, M. E., Brumsack, H. J., Bohrmann, G., and Emeis, K. C.: Barite fronts in continental
24 margin sediments: A new look at barium remobilization in the zone of sulfate reduction and
25 formation of heavy barites in diagenetic fronts, *Chemical Geology*, 127, 125-139,
26 10.1016/0009-2541(95)00090-9, 1996.

27 Tostevin, R., Turchyn, A. V., Farquhar, J., Johnston, D. T., Eldridge, D. L., Bishop, J. K. B.,
28 and McIlvin, M.: Multiple sulfur isotope constraints on the modern sulfur cycle, *Earth and*
29 *Planetary Science Letters*, 396, 14-21, 10.1016/j.epsl.2014.03.057, 2014.

- 1 Turchyn, A. V., and Schrag, D. P.: Oxygen isotope constraints on the sulfur cycle over the past
2 10 million years, *Science*, 303, 2004-2007, 2004.
- 3 Warren, J. K.: *Evaporites; sediments, resources, and hydrocarbons*, Springer, Berlin,
4 Heidelberg, New York, 2006.
- 5 Warren, J. K.: Evaporites through time: Tectonic, climatic and eustatic controls in marine and
6 nonmarine deposits, *Earth-Science Reviews*, 98, 217-268, 10.1016/j.earscirev.2009.11.004,
7 2010.
- 8 Werne, J. P., Hollander, D. J., Lyons, T. W. and Sinninghe Damsté, J. S.: Organic sulfur
9 biogeochemistry: Recent advances and future research directions, *Geol. Soc. Am. Spec. Pap.*,
10 379, 135–150, doi:10.1130/0-8137-2379-5.135, 2004.
- 11 White, S. M., Crisp, J. A., and Spera, F. J.: Long-term volumetric eruption rates and magma
12 budgets, *Geochemistry Geophysics Geosystems*, 7, Q03010, 10.1029/2005gc001002, 2006.
- 13 Wollast, R.: *The Coastal Organic-Carbon Cycle - Fluxes, Sources, And Sinks, Ocean Margin
14 Processes in Global Change*, 365-381, J. Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1991.
- 15 Wortmann, U. G., Bernasconi, S. M., and Bottcher, M. E.: Hypersulfidic deep biosphere
16 indicates extreme sulfur isotope fractionation during single-step microbial sulfate reduction,
17 *Geology*, 29, 647-650, 10.1130/0091-7613(2001)029<0647:hdbies>2.0.co;2, 2001.
- 18 Wortmann, U. G., and Chernyavsky, B. M.: Effect of evaporite deposition on Early
19 Cretaceous carbon and sulphur cycling, *Nature*, 446, 654-656, 10.1038/nature05693, 2007.
- 20 Wortmann, U. G., and Paytan, A.: Rapid Variability of Seawater Chemistry Over the Past 130
21 Million Years, *Science*, 337, 334-336, 10.1126/science.1220656, 2012.
- 22 Zimmermann, H.: Tertiary seawater chemistry - Implications from primary fluid inclusions in
23 marine halite, *American Journal of Science*, 300, 723-767, 10.2475/ajs.300.10.723, 2000.


1 Table 1. Model fluxes and sulfur isotope ratios in the steady state

Flux	Initial flux– steady state [mol SO ₄ /year]	Isotopic composition [‰] $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ (VCDT)	References
Pyrite weathering	1.5x10 ¹²	-15	Kump, 1989; Garrels and Lerman, 1981; Petsch and Berner, 1998; Seal, 2006;
Evaporite weathering	2x10 ¹²	21	Kump, 1989; Garrels and Lerman, 1981; see also Hansen and Wallmann, 2003; for $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{evap}}$ see Claypool et al., 1980
Volcanic flux	0.34x10 ¹²	3	Hansen and Wallmann, 2003 and references therein
Pyrite Burial	1.6x10 ¹²	-18*	Bottrell and Newton, 2006; Turchyn and Schrag, 2004; Berner, 1982; Petsch and Berner, 1998
Evaporite precipitation	2.24x10 ¹²	22 ^{&}	Kump, 1989; Garrels and Lerman, 1981; Petsch and Berner, 1998

Note: The global sulfur fluxes are not well constrained. All fluxes used to achieve steady state are scaled within the range of previously published estimates (see reference list). The initial sulfate concentration is 27 mmol/l which is in the range of estimates based on fluid inclusions in halite for late Miocene/Pliocene (Horita et al., 2002; Zimmermann, 2000; Brennan et al., 2013).

*Steady state value calculated as a function of other known fluxes (see text).

[&]This is used for model initialization. Later on isotope value of respective seawater sulfate.



16 Figure 1. Sea level and shelf area estimate. A) Sea level estimate (Miller et al., 2011) B)
 17 Calculated shelf area using polynomial fit (Bjerrum et al., 2006) of ETOPO-5 global mean
 18 hypsometric curve

19
 20
 21
 22
 23







Figure 2. Seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value. The circles denote the measured seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value, the shaded area the 95% confidence interval of a LOESS approximation of the “true” $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{SO}_4}$ value



1
2 Figure 3. Model forcing. A) Pyrite weathering B) Evaporite weathering C) Pyrite burial D)
3 Pyrite reservoir on the shelf



11 Figure 4. Sulfur isotope offset between contemporary seawater sulfate and pyrite (Δ_{pyr} – see
12 text for details) vs shelf area



1
2 Figure 5. Model output – seawater sulfate $\delta^{34}\text{S}$ value. Brown solid line - model output with
3 constant offset of -40‰ between $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{seawater}}$ and $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{pyrite}}$ values. Grey solid line - model
4 output with variable offset between $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{seawater}}$ and $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{pyrite}}$ values (see Figure 3). Red dashed
5 line – model output with constant Δ_{pyr} offset and 50% larger shelf pyrite sub-reservoir. Green
6 dashed line- model output with constant Δ_{pyr} offset and 50% smaller shelf pyrite sub-reservoir.
7 The shaded area the 95% confidence interval of a LOESS approximation of the “true” $\delta^{34}\text{S}_{\text{SO}_4}$
8 value.