



HAL
open science

Global biosphere primary productivity changes during the past eight glacial cycles

Ji-Woong Yang, Margaux Brandon, Amaëlle Landais, Stéphanie Duchamp-Alphonse, Thomas Blunier, Frédéric Prié, Thomas Extier

► **To cite this version:**

Ji-Woong Yang, Margaux Brandon, Amaëlle Landais, Stéphanie Duchamp-Alphonse, Thomas Blunier, et al.. Global biosphere primary productivity changes during the past eight glacial cycles. *Science*, 2022, 375 (6585), pp.1145-1151. 10.1126/science.abj8826 . hal-03836276

HAL Id: hal-03836276

<https://hal.science/hal-03836276v1>

Submitted on 4 Nov 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Title: Global biosphere primary productivity changes during the last eight glacial cycles

Authors: Ji-Woong Yang^{1*†}, Margaux Brandon^{1,2‡}, Amaëlle Landais¹, Stéphanie Duchamp-Alphonse², Thomas Blunier³, Frédéric Prié¹, Thomas Extier^{1§}

Affiliations:

¹Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement/Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace, Université Paris Saclay/CEA/CNRS/UVSQ; Gif-sur-Yvette, France.

²Géosciences Paris-Saclay, Université Paris Saclay; Orsay, France.

³Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen; København N, Denmark.

*Corresponding author. Email: ji-woong.yang@lsce.ipsl.fr

†Present address: Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen; København N, Denmark

‡Present address: Laboratoire d'Océanographie et du Climat/Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace, Sorbonne Université/CNRS/IRD/MNHN; Paris, France

§Present address: Environnements et Paléoenvironnements Océaniques et Continentaux, Université de Bordeaux/CNRS/EPHE; Pessac, France

Abstract: Global biosphere productivity is the largest uptake flux of atmospheric CO₂, playing an important role in past and future carbon cycle. However, global estimate of the biosphere productivity remains a challenge. Using the ancient air enclosed in polar ice cores, we present the first 800,000-year record of triple isotopic ratios of air oxygen which reflects past global biosphere productivity. We observe that the global biosphere productivity in the last eight glacial intervals was lower than modern, and that in most cases, it starts to increase millennia before deglaciations. Both variations occur concomitantly with CO₂ changes, implying a dominant control of CO₂ on global biosphere productivity which supports a pervasive negative feedback under glacial climate.

One-Sentence Summary: Global photosynthesis has been coevolved with CO₂ during the last eight glacial intervals.

Main Text: Atmospheric carbon dioxide (CO₂) is a potent greenhouse gas that, together with orbital changes, is a primary determinant of Earth's global climate. Measurements of the CO₂ mixing ratio of air trapped in ice cores over the last 800 thousand years (ka) reveal clear glacial-interglacial cycles (1, 2) showing a good correlation with global sea-level changes (3). The Southern Ocean (SO) is thought to have played a major role in these CO₂ variations through changes in sea-ice cover, overturning circulation and biological productivity (4–7), and there is growing evidence that the terrestrial vegetation may be a significant contributor as well (e.g., 8). Nevertheless, there are periods where CO₂ concentration decouples from sea-level, particularly during full glacial periods when CO₂ shows relatively stable or slightly rising trends while sea-level continues to decline (9, 10).

To explain this CO₂ evolution during full glacial times, Galbraith and Eggleston (10) hypothesized a negative feedback by which global photosynthesis becomes limited by low atmospheric CO₂ concentrations, prohibiting further CO₂ drawdown. This hypothesis has not been proven yet by observations since the reconstructions of past biosphere productivity are based on geochemical (e.g., organic and inorganic biomarkers) and micropaleontological (e.g., pollen, coccolith, diatoms) data from sediment archives which provide indirect and only qualitative reconstructions (e.g., 11). Furthermore, they show sometimes contrasting changes making it difficult to estimate global variations. As an example, terrestrial vegetation records (e.g., arboreal pollen fraction) show a drastic decrease during glacial times, while phytoplankton indicators (mainly TOC and alkenones) in the Subantarctic Zone (SAZ), a key part of the SO (6, 12), suggest intensified marine productivity.

The above limitations can be alleviated by using measurements of the triple isotope composition (¹⁶O, ¹⁷O, and ¹⁸O) of atmospheric oxygen (O₂), a marker of global gross productivity expressed in O₂ flux (13). The triple isotopic composition of O₂ is primarily affected by O-isotope exchange with CO₂ during photochemical reactions in the stratosphere and biological reactions of photosynthesis and respiration (13, 14). The heavy isotopes (¹⁷O and ¹⁸O) are discriminated relative to the light one (¹⁶O) in a mass-dependent way during most biological reactions. On the contrary, O₂-CO₂ isotope exchange in the stratosphere fractionates in a mass-independent manner (13–15). Accordingly, to estimate relative contribution of biosphere and stratosphere fluxes, the ¹⁷O anomaly of O₂ is defined as: $^{17}\Delta \equiv \ln(\delta^{17}\text{O} + 1) - \lambda_{ref} \cdot \ln(\delta^{18}\text{O} + 1)$ (16), where λ_{ref} is the mass-dependent reference slope of 0.516 calculated from the modern O₂ isotope fractionations within the global biospheric cycle (16, 17). By definition, tropospheric ¹⁷Δ is not much modified by the mass-dependent fractionation within biosphere. Closed terrarium experiments showed that without stratospheric exchange, biospheric processes induce a positive ¹⁷Δ signal relative to the present atmosphere (13). In contrast, the stratospheric air measurements from rocket (15), aircraft (e.g., 20, 21), and balloons (e.g., 21, 22) observed a highly positive ¹⁷Δ of CO₂ as a result of photolysis of O₂ and ozone (O₃) and atomic O exchange with CO₂ (23), which is counterbalanced by a slight depletion of ¹⁷Δ of the O₂ reservoir in the stratosphere (¹⁷Δ_{strat}) because of small abundance (mixing ratio) of O₃ relative to O₂ (24). In the present atmosphere, the input of positively fractionated ¹⁷Δ from the biosphere (¹⁷Δ_{bio}) is equilibrated by a massive flux of O₂ with slightly negative ¹⁷Δ from the stratosphere. The sizes of the two endmember fluxes from the biosphere and the stratosphere hence drive the ¹⁷Δ variations, so by knowing magnitudes of the O₂ isotopic fractionations in the stratosphere and O₂ fluxes from the

stratosphere (F_{strat}), $^{17}\Delta$ can be used to reconstruct the gross O_2 flux from Earth biosphere (F_{bio}), or global gross primary productivity in terms of O_2 (GPP- O_2).

Stratospheric influence on tropospheric $^{17}\Delta$ is through different factors including F_{strat} , stratosphere temperature, photochemical reaction rates, and O_3 abundance in the stratosphere.

Numerical simulations show that greenhouse gases (predominantly CO_2) play an important role in controlling the above-mentioned changes in the stratosphere (e.g., 25-28), allowing the stratosphere effect to be scaled to CO_2 changes such that high CO_2 mixing ratio in troposphere induces strong depletion in $^{17}\Delta$ [see (29) for more details]. It should be noted that O_2 photolysis in the mesosphere may cause additional fractionation (30). However, model simulations suggest that the entrainment of mesospheric air into the stratosphere is small ($\sim 0.02\%$) (30), and its effect on the tropospheric $^{17}\Delta$ is expected to be negligible (29).

As a consequence, the imprint of the stratospheric mass-independent fractionation is reflected in the general anti-correlation between CO_2 and $^{17}\Delta$. However, CO_2 and $^{17}\Delta$ are not always anti-correlated as they decouple when changes in biosphere productivity occur. For example, Brandon *et al.* (8) pointed out that the notable decoupling over Termination V (TV) – Marine Isotope Stage (MIS) 11 interval may be interpreted as an imprint of exceptionally high biosphere productivity. Therefore, the decoupling between CO_2 and $^{17}\Delta$ is the key to infer the past evolution of global biosphere productivity, which provides unique insights into the past global carbon cycle.

The previous ice-core record of $^{17}\Delta$ extends over the last 444.8 ka (8, 31). During the last 4 glacial cycles characterized by a large glacial-interglacial amplitude and a periodicity of ~ 100 ka, the inferred global biosphere productivity was systematically lower during glacial than during interglacial times (31). The amplitude of temperature and CO_2 changes over glacial-interglacial transitions was smaller before 450 ka and the glacial periods were shorter than after 450 ka (2). Knowing the global biosphere productivity over the period 800–450 ka is hence of uttermost importance to study the interactions between the Earth biosphere and CO_2 level during the glacial-interglacial cycles. Here we extend the $^{17}\Delta$ records back to ~ 796 ka by analyzing samples from the European Project for Ice Coring in Antarctica Dome C (EDC) ice core (29). The data were corrected for the fractionations by gas-loss during ice storage, gravitational settling, and bubble close-off (29).

Decoupling between $^{17}\Delta$ and CO_2

The fully corrected EDC $^{17}\Delta$ data are plotted with CO_2 in Fig. 1. We observe a general anti-correlation between CO_2 and $^{17}\Delta$ over the last 796 ka ($r = -0.73$, Fig. 1G and fig. S2). However, this anti-correlation does not hold true during glacial intervals (Fig. 1. A to C): the moving correlation coefficients between CO_2 and $^{17}\Delta$ show a significant positive correlation in the middle of glacial intervals of MISs 6, 8, 10, 12, 16, and 18 (Fig. 1E). Indeed, CO_2 concentrations show stable- or slightly increasing trends while $^{17}\Delta$ signals gradually increase to glacial maxima (Fig. 1C). We illustrate this decoupling between $^{17}\Delta$ and CO_2 through the $^{17}\Delta$ offset (Fig. 1D) which is the difference between the ice-core $^{17}\Delta$ and a hypothetical $^{17}\Delta$ ($^{17}\Delta_{\text{arb}}$) purely driven by stratospheric fractionation (Fig. 1C and fig. S3) (32). Negative $^{17}\Delta$ offsets (orange in Fig. 1D, 1G, and 1I) result from reduced biosphere productivity while positive ones (green in Fig. 1D, 1G, and 1I) can be explained by enhanced biosphere productivity. The negative offsets (reduced

productivity) are found at earlier stages of glacial periods, while the positive ones (increased productivity) prevail from later stages of glacial to interglacial periods.

GPP-O₂ reconstructions using box models

To obtain a more quantitative assessment of past changes in global biosphere productivity, we applied two different box models [TB model (31) and AL model (33)] describing triple O₂ isotope budgets in biosphere, troposphere, and stratosphere. Assuming steady-state, both models calculate the biosphere O₂ flux so that the biosphere input of ¹⁷Δ is balanced by O₂ flux from the stratosphere, which is estimated from the CO₂ concentration in the troposphere (13). The different assumptions made by the two models and their limitations are described in SM (29).

The reconstructed GPP-O₂ from the two different models are presented in Fig. 2B in terms of the ratio between the global biosphere O₂ flux of the past ($F_{\text{bio},t}$) and the global biosphere O₂ flux of the preindustrial condition ($F_{\text{bio,PST}}$). Although the two model results are not necessarily identical, they share common features that confirm our qualitative inferences based on ¹⁷Δ offset (Fig. 1): (i) they reveal clear glacial (low productivity) - interglacial (high productivity) cycles during the last 796 ka, (ii) the GPP-O₂ minima during each glacial period occurred under intermediate sea-level, and concomitantly with glacial CO₂ minima (mid-glacial stage) (Fig. 2, A and B), (iii) following the glacial minima, GPP-O₂ increases while global ice volume continues to grow until the glacial maxima (full-glacial stage), millennia before the glacial terminations (Figs. 2B and 3B).

Glacial-Interglacial changes

Both box-model results indicate concomitant GPP-O₂ and CO₂ minima during each of the 8 glacial intervals (Fig. 2) with glacial productivity minima which are estimated to lie between 55% and 87% of modern. We explore below the possible contributions of marine and terrestrial productivity to this large reduction of global GPP-O₂ under glacial times.

The only global compilation of marine sedimentary records of marine productivity that exist for glacial times focuses on the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) and indicates stronger export production and probably higher marine primary productivity (PP) during the LGM than during the Holocene (12). Over the last 800 ka, the very few available marine export production (EP) records suggested to reflect PP reveal spatially different patterns during glacial times. The alkenone concentration at ODP 1090 site located in the SAZ shows an increased PP during glacial periods (6), while biogenic barium (Ba/Fe) from ODP 1094 in Antarctic Zone (AZ) of the SO (34), and Ba/Al ratio from ODP 882 core in the subarctic Pacific (35) indicate reduced PP (Figs. 2G-I). In addition, the Ba/Ti from the core TT013-PC72 in the Equatorial Pacific exhibits no clear G-IG pattern (36) (Fig. 2J). None of those records explain our reconstructed lower global GPP-O₂ during glacial periods. Global ocean PP in glacial times is difficult to predict and ocean biogeochemical models have shown contrasting results: some predict greater global PP in LGM (37), while others represent the opposite (38) or no clear change (39). On the one hand, a decrease of ocean PP is expected because colder sea surface temperature (SST) reduces the metabolic rate of marine phytoplankton (e.g., 40), shoaling of overturning circulation reduces the intake of nutrient-rich deep water (41) and highly productive continental shelf area are lost by sea-level decline. On the other hand, an increase of ocean PP could arise from greatly enhanced

aeolian dust deposition that supplies iron to high-nutrient low-chlorophyll (HPLC) oceans such as SO (e.g., 6).

No direct proxies for terrestrial GPP exists but we do have indirect vegetation cover proxies, some of which reflect glacial shrinking and interglacial expansion patterns. Two long-term pollen assembly records in Europe – Tenaghi Phillippon (42) and Lake Ohrid (43) – clearly indicate a near vanishing arboreal-type pollen (AP) during glacial periods (Fig. 2K). In addition, woodland and mountain forest type vegetations from MD96-2048 core off SE Africa exhibit G-IG variations (44) (Fig. 2L). Similar G-IG patterns are observed in biogenic silica records from BDP-96 core from Lake Baikal (45) (Fig. 2M).

Several arguments favor a stronger decrease in terrestrial GPP than in marine PP during glacial intervals. Nearly 90 ppm lower CO₂ in glacial atmosphere would have a strong negative fertilizing effect on photosynthesis of terrestrial vegetation (46, 47), whereas its impact on marine PP is expected to be minor (48). A modelling study using a dynamic global vegetation model (DGVM) shows that a CO₂ increase of 185 to 285 rises by more than a factor of two, the vegetation GPP (46). The temperature and precipitation impact on terrestrial GPP are less clear. Although modern observations suggest temperature and precipitation as important controls for terrestrial GPP (e.g., 49), model studies show that climate change alone (without changes in CO₂) has limited impact on glacial-interglacial vegetation GPP changes (47, 50). A glacial sea-level low-stand might have two opposing effects, with the exposure of continental shelves promoting increased amounts of new vegetation (51, 52) and ice-sheet expansion prohibiting photosynthesis in the ice-covered area. Previous DGVM simulations suggested that the relative sea-level (RSL) decline would increase LGM vegetation net primary productivity (NPP) by ~8% relative to constant RSL results (53). Taken together, it is therefore likely that the G-IG changes in global GPP-O₂ are largely driven by terrestrial productivity, whose evolution is strongly influenced by CO₂.

Glacial productivity changes

The glacial productivity minima occur at mid-glacial stages, followed by the systematic increase in GPP-O₂ from mid- to full-glacial stages. Such increase in productivity between mid and full glacial is not easy to detect from paleoproductivity proxies because of a lack of high-resolution records and/or chronological issues. In the ocean, neither ODP 1090 alkenone concentrations nor ODP 882 Ba/Al records exhibit detectable shift between the two stages, with the exceptions of MISs 6 and 12 (ODP 1090) and MIS 8 (ODP 882) (Figs. 2G and 2I). In parallel, the TT-13-PC72 Ba/Ti record starts to rise several millennia prior to maximum productivity at deglacial terminations (Fig. 2J). In the terrestrial realm, the arboreal pollen fractions at Tenaghi Phillippon, Lake Ohrid, and biogenic silica at Lake Baikal indicate nearly vanished productivity during glacial times, showing no clear trends during the mid- to full-glacial changes (Fig 2, K to M). In contrast, the MD96-2048 pollen assemblage records show that the fractions of woodland and mountain forest species increased in the late-glacial stages during certain glacial intervals such as MISs 6, 8, 10, and 12 (Fig. 2J). Therefore, despite the complexity of comparing our GPP-O₂ records with local records, the GPP-O₂ increase between mid and full glacial is confirmed by some local records.

There are several ways in which the possible contributions of the main potential drivers of GPP-O₂ might help to explain the increasing GPP-O₂ signal between full and mid-glacial stages. As mentioned above, the CO₂ fertilization effect may play a significant role and there is a clear correlation between GPP-O₂ and CO₂ changes over the mid to full glacial stages (Fig. 4). The

observed GPP-O₂ vs CO₂ changes agree with second order fitting of Chen *et al.* (46)'s sensitivity simulations (Fig. 4A). However, over MISs 8 and 16, the GPP-O₂ vs CO₂ relationship is slightly different, suggesting that factors other than CO₂ concentration affect the GPP-O₂ evolution during glacial periods (Fig. 4A).

5 First, the global temperature change between mid and full-glacial stages is minor, as observed from the global air surface temperature (GAST) reconstructions (54) and a global sea surface temperature (SST) stack (9), which show no warming, or only minor changes (Fig. 3).

10 Second, RSL reconstructions indicate sea-level declines of 10 to 30 meters between mid- and full-glacial stages in most glacial periods (55) (Fig. 3). Recalling that there was an ~8% increase in terrestrial NPP at the LGM for an RSL change of ~120 m (53, 55), the sea-level decline between two glacial stages should have only a small effect. Moreover, the comparison between GPP-O₂ and RSL records show no strong relationship (Fig. 4D). Therefore, we consider that the sea-level changes have minor impact on glacial GPP-O₂ changes.

15 Third, low-latitude hydrological changes could play a role as well, as global vegetation is expected to be shifted southerly during glacial periods due to Northern Hemisphere (NH) ice sheet expansion (e.g., 56). Climate model experiments for the LGM show an increase in precipitation in Southern Hemisphere (SH) low-latitude regions, such as Amazonia and South Africa, by which modelled vegetation NPP is increased in tropical- and temperate forests compared to present (47). Proxies for past evolution of the low latitude water cycle exist such as
20 the Dole effect (DE) i.e., the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ offset between air O₂ and sea water (14) and speleothem $\delta^{18}\text{O}_{\text{calcite}}$ from Chinese caves (57). The long DE records (58) indicate a mid- to full-glacial enrichment over most glacial periods when GPP-O₂ increases, which implies a further southward shift of the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) from mid to full glacial stages (Fig. 4B). This is supported by Chinese caves $\delta^{18}\text{O}_{\text{calcite}}$ records over MISs 6 and 10 (57). Therefore, above
25 evidence suggest that southward shift of the ITCZ at the full-glacial stages might have stimulated terrestrial GPP-O₂.

Finally, marine productivity may also contribute to this GPP-O₂ increase, especially in the SO, where the primary productivity is usually limited by iron (e.g., 46). This iron limitation is alleviated by greater dust deposition into the SAZ, caused by stronger wind, together with glacial
30 aridity and meridional shift of westerly winds (6). However, the changes in EDC dust flux are not systematically positively correlated with GPP-O₂ increases (Fig. 4C): the full-glacial increases in EDC dust flux are observed only in MISs 6, 12, and 16, where the GPP-O₂ increases are relatively small (Fig. 4C).

Our $^{17}\Delta$ data provide a complete view of global biosphere productivity evolution during the last
35 800 ka which confirms the pervasive glacial (low GPP) – interglacial (high GPP) cycles, and demonstrate an important feature of intra-glacial GPP shift. The GPP reconstructions and proxy evidence discussed here suggest that much of the GPP-O₂ changes over glacial-interglacial cycles and between two glacial stages are dominantly attributable to CO₂ changes and that, in both cases, terrestrial GPP might have played an important role. Our findings also demonstrate
40 the close interactions of global photosynthesis with CO₂ over the last 800 ka, providing observational evidence of the pervasive negative feedback between global photosynthesis and CO₂ (10).

References and Notes

1. D. Lüthi *et al.*, *Nature* 453, 379–382 (2008). doi:10.1038/nature06949
2. B. Bereiter *et al.*, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 42, 542–549 (2015). doi:10.1002/2014GL061957
3. G. L. Foster, E. J. Rohling, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 110, 1209–1214 (2013).
5 doi:10.1073/pnas.1216073110
4. B. B. Stephens, R. F. Keeling, *Nature* 404, 171–174 (2000). doi:10.1038/35004556
5. D. M. Sigman, M. P. Hain, G. H. Haug, *Nature* 466, 47–55 (2010). doi:10.1038/nature09149
6. A. Martínez-García *et al.*, *Paleoceanography* 24, PA1207 (2009). doi:10.1029/2008PA001657
7. S. Duchamp-Alphonse *et al.*, *Nature Commun.* 9, 2396 (2018). doi:10.1038/s41467-018-
10 04625-7
8. M. Brandon *et al.*, *Nat. Commun.* 11, 2112 (2020). doi:10.1038/s41467-020-15739-2
9. J. D. Shakun, D. W. Lea, L. E. Lisiecki, M. E. Raymo, *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 426, 58–68
(2015). doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2015.05.042
10. E. D. Galbraith, S. Eggleson, *Nat. Geosci.* 10, 295–298 (2017). doi:10.1038/NGEO2914
- 15 11. K. B. Averyt, A. Paytan, *Paleoceanography* 19, PA4003 (2004). doi:10.1029/2004PA001005.
12. K. E. Kohfeld, C. Le Quéré, S. P. Harrison, R. F. Anderson, *Science* 308, 74–78 (2005).
 doi:10.1126/science.1105375
13. B. Luz, E. Barkan, M. L. Bender, M. H. Thiemens, K. A. Boering, *Nature* 400, 547–550
(1999). doi:10.1038/22987
- 20 14. M. Bender, T. Sowers, L. Labeyrie, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 8, 363–376 (1994).
 doi:10.1029/94GB00724
15. M. H. Thiemens, T. Jackson, E. C. Jipf, P. W. Erdman, C. van Egmond, *Science* 270, 969–
972 (1995). doi:10.1126/science.270.5238.969
- 25 16. B. Luz, E. Barkan, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 69, 1099–1110 (2005).
 doi:10.1016/j.gca.2004.09.001

17. Recent laboratory incubation studies suggested either lower λ of ~ 0.510 (18) or higher λ of ~ 0.522 (19) during dark respiration, however, sensitivity tests performed with λ of 0.510 and 0.520 lead to $^{17}\Delta$ variations within uncertainty range. See (29) for more details.
18. J. L. Ash, H. Hu, L. Y. Yeung, ACS Earth Space Chem. 4, 50-66 (2020).
5 doi:10.1021/acsearthspacechem.9b00230
19. D. A. Stolper, W. W. Fischer, M. L. Bender, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta 240, 152-172
(2018). doi:10.1016/j.gca.2018.07.039
20. K. A. Boering *et al.*, Geophys. Res. Lett. 31, L03109 (2004). doi:10.1029/2003GL018451
21. A. A. Wiegel *et al.*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 110, 17680-17685 (2013).
10 doi:10.1073/pnas.1213082110
22. B. Alexander, M. K. Vollmer, T. Jackson, R. F. Weiss, M. H. Thiemens, Geophys. Res. Lett.
28, 4103-4106 (2001). doi:10.1029/2001GL013692
23. Y. L. Yung, W. B. DeMore, J. P. Pinto, Geophys. Res. Lett. 18, 13-16 (1991).
 doi:10.1029/90GL02478
- 15 24. M. H. Thiemens, M. Lin, Rev. Mineral. Geochem. 86, 35-95 (2021).
 doi:10.2138/rmg.2021.86.02
25. N. Butchart *et al.*, Clim. Dyn. 27, 727-741 (2006). doi:10.1007/s00382-006-0162-4
26. K. P. Shine *et al.*, Quart. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc. 129, 1565-1588 (2003). doi:10.1256/qr.02.186.
27. G. Chiodo *et al.*, J. Clim. 31, 3893-3907 (2018). doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-17-0492.s1.
- 20 28. E. L. Fleming, C. H. Jackman, R. S. Stolarski, A. R. Douglas, Atmos. Chem. Phys. 11, 8515-
 8541 (2011). doi:10.5194/acp-11-8515-2011
29. Materials and methods are available as supplementary materials.
30. M.-C. Liang, G. A. Blake, B. R. Lewis, Y. L. Yung, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 104, 21-25
(2006). doi:10.1073/pnas.0610009104
- 25 31. T. Blunier, M. L. Bender, B. Barnett, J. C. von Fischer, Clim. Past 8, 1509-1526 (2012).
 doi:10.5194/cp-8-1509-2012

32. $^{17}\Delta_{\text{arb}}$ is the expected $^{17}\Delta$ in the troposphere if biosphere (F_{bio} and $^{17}\Delta_{\text{bio}}$) remains constant over time, hence it is hypothesized to be affected by the stratosphere only. The stratosphere changes are assumed to be limited by CO_2 (13, 33). $^{17}\Delta_{\text{arb}}$ is therefore calculated as tropospheric $^{17}\Delta$ in the steady-state equations S2 and S4 in the 3-box model (AL model) by assuming constant F_{bio} and $^{17}\Delta_{\text{bio}}$ [see (29) for more details].
33. A. Landais, J. Lathiere, E. Barkan, B. Luz, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 21, GB1025 (2007). doi:10.1029/2006GB002739
34. S. L. Jaccard *et al.*, *Science* 339, 1419-1423 (2013). doi:10.1126/science.1227545
35. S. L. Jaccard, E. D. Galbraith, D. M. Sigman, G. H. Haug, *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 29, 206-212 (2010). doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2009.10.007
36. R. W. Murray, C. Knowlton, M. Leinen, A. C. Mix, C. H. Polsky, *Paleoceanography and Paleoclimatology* 15, 570-592 (2000). doi:10.1029/1999PA000457
37. V. Brovkin, A. Ganopolski, D. Archer, S. Rahmstorf, *Paleoceanography* 22, PA4202 (2007). doi:10.1029/2006PA001380
38. A. Tagliabue *et al.*, *Clim. Past* 5, 695-706 (2009). doi:10.5194/cp-5-695-2009
39. L. Bopp, K. E. Kohfeld, C. Le Quéré, O. Aumont, *Paleoceanography* 18, 1046 (2003). doi:10.1029/2002PA000810
40. R. W. Eppley, *Fish. Bull.* 70, 1063 (1972).
41. J. B. Palter, J. L. Sarmiento, A. Gnanadesikan, J. Simeon, R. D. Slater, *Biogeosciences* 7, 3549-3568 (2010). doi:10.5194/bg-7-3549-2010
42. P. C. Tzedakis, H. Hooghiemstra, H. Pälike, *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 25, 3416-3430 (2006). doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2006.09.002
43. L. Sadori *et al.*, *Biogeosciences* 13, 1423-1437 (2016). doi:10.5194/bg-13-1423-2016
44. L. M. Dupont, T. Caley, I. S. Castaneda, *Clim. Past* 15, 1083-1097 (2019). doi:10.5194/cp-15-1083-2019
45. A. A. Prokopenko, L. A. Hinnov, D. F. Williams, M. I. Kuzmin, *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 25, 3431-3457 (2006). doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2006.10.002
46. W. Chen *et al.*, *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 218, 293-305 (2019). doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2019.06.003

47. M. N. Woillez *et al.*, *Clim. Past* 7, 557-577 (2011). doi :10.5194/cp-7-557-2011
48. M. Hein, K. Sand-Jensen, *Nature* 388, 526-527 (1997). doi:10.1038/41457
49. A. Anav *et al.*, *Rev. Geophys.* 53, 785-818 (2015). doi:10.1002/2015RG000483
50. M. Martin Calvo, I. C. Prentice, *New Phytol.* 208, 987-994 (2015). doi:10.1111/nph.13485
- 5 51. T. Hanebuth, K. Stattegger, P. M. Grootes, *Science* 288, 1033-1035 (2000). doi:
10.1126/science.288.5468.1033
52. X. Wang, X. Sun, P. Wang, K. Stattegger, *Palaeogeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.* 278, 88-
97 (2009). doi:10.1016/j.palaeo.2009.04.008
53. B. A. A. Hoogakker *et al.*, *Clim. Past* 12, 51-73 (2016). doi:10.5194/cp-12-51-2016
- 10 54. C. W. Snyder, *Nature* 538, 226-228 (2016). doi:10.1038/nature19798
55. R. M. Spratt, L. E. Lisiecki, *Clim. Past* 12, 1079-1092 (2016). doi:10.5194/cp-12-1079-2016
56. I. C. Prentice, S. P. Harrison, P. J. Bartlein, *New Phytol.* 189, 988-998 (2011). doi:
10.1111/j.1469-8137.2010.03620.x
57. H. Cheng *et al.*, *Nature* 534, 640-646 (2016). doi:10.1038/nature18591
- 15 58. E. Huang *et al.*, *Sci. Adv.* 6, eaba4823 (2020). doi:10.1126/sciadv.aba4823
59. M. P. Hain, D. M. Sigman, G. H. Haug, in *Treatise on Geochemistry, Volume 8: The Oceans
and Marine Geochemistry*, H. D. Holland, K. K. Turekian, Eds. (Elsevier, ed. 2, 2014),
pp. 485-517. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-095975-7.00618-5
60. T. Blunier, B. Barnett, M. L. Bender, M. B. Hendricks, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 16, 1029
20 (2002). doi:10.1029/2001GB001460
61. L. E. Lisiecki, M. E. Raymo, *Paleoceanography* 20, PA1003 (2005).
doi:10.1029/2004PA001071
62. L. Bazin *et al.*, *Clim. Past* 9, 1715-1731 (2013). doi:10.5194/cp-9-1715-2013
63. D. Veres *et al.*, *Clim. Past* 9, 1733-1748 (2013). doi:10.5194/cp-9-1733-2013
- 25 64. F. Lambert, M. Bigler, J. P. Steffensen, M. Hutterli, H. Fischer, *Clim. Past* 8, 609-623
(2012). doi:10.5194/cp-8-609-2012
65. T. Extier *et al.*, *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 185, 244-257 (2018). doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2018.02.008

66. J. -W. Yang *et al.*, Triple isotope composition of O₂ records from EPICA Dome C over 453 –
796 ka, PANGAEA (2022): <http://doi.org/10.1594/PANGAEA.xxxxxx>.
67. E. Barkan, B. Luz, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 17, 2809-2814 (2003)
doi:10.1002/rcm.1267
- 5 68. G. B. Dreyfus *et al.*, *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 29, 28-42 (2010). doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2009.10.012
69. M. Suwa, M. L. Bender, *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 27, 1093-1106 (2008).
doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2008.02.017
70. F. Parrenin *et al.*, *Science* 339, 1060-1063 (2013). doi:10.1126/science.1226368
71. D. A. Stolper, M. L. Bender, G. B. Dreyfus, Y. Yan, J. A. Higgins, *Science* 353, 1427-1430
10 (2016). doi:10.1126/science.aaf5445
72. C. Appenzeller, J. R. Holton, K. H. Rosenlof, *J. Geophys. Res.* 101, 15071-15078 (1996).
doi:10.1029/96JD00821
73. R. A. Berner, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 65, 685-694 (2001). doi:10.1016/S0016-
7037(00)00572-X
- 15 74. H. D. Holland, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* 66, 3811-3826 (2002). doi:10.1016/S0016-
7037(02)00950-X
75. B. Luz, E. Barkan, *Science* 288, 2028-2031 (2000). doi:10.1126/science.288.5473.2028
76. B. Luz, E. Barkan, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 38, L19606 (2011). doi:10.1029/2011GL049138
77. C. Waelbroeck *et al.*, *Quat. Sci. Rev.* 21, 295-305 (2002). doi:10.1016/S0277-
20 3791(01)00101-9
78. E. Barkan, B. Luz, *Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom.* 19, 3737-3742 (2005).
doi:10.1002/rcm.2250
79. G. Hoffmann, J. Jouzel, V. Masson, *Hydrol. Process.* 14, 1385-1406 (2000).
doi:10.1002/1099-1085(20000615)14:8<1385::AID-HYP989>3.0.CO;2-1
- 25 80. M. R. Badger, S. von Caemmerer, S. Ruuska, H. Nakano, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* 355,
1433-1446 (2000). doi:10.1098/rstb.2000.0704
81. Y. Helman, E. Barkan, D. Eisenstadt, B. Luz, A. Kaplan, *Plant Physiol.* 138, 2292-2298
(2005). doi:10.1104/pp.105.063768

82. A. Angert *et al.*, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 17, 1089 (2003). doi:10.1029/2003GB002056
83. M. Ribas-Carbo *et al.*, *Plant Cell Environ.* 23, 983-989 (2000). doi:10.1046/j.1365-3040.2000.00607.x
84. R. D. Guy, M. L. Fogel, J. A. Berry, *Plant Physiol.* 101, 37-47 (1993).
5 doi:10.1104/pp.101.1.37
85. C. B. Field, M. J. Behrenfeld, J. T. Randerson, P. Falkowski, *Science* 281, 237-240 (1998).
 doi:10.1126/science.281.5374.237
86. L. M. François, C. Delire, P. Warnant, G. Munhoven, *Global Planet. Change* 16, 37-52
 (1998). doi:10.1016/S0921-8181(98)00005-8
- 10 87. F. Joos, S. Gerber, I. C. Prentice, B. L. Otto-Bliesner, P. J. Valdes, *Global Biogeochem.*
 Cycles 18, GB2002 (2004). doi:10.1029/2003GB002156
88. M. G. Prokopenko, O. M. Pauluis, J. Granger, L. Y. Yeung, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 38, L14603
 (2011). doi:10.1029/2011GL047652
89. R. Winkler *et al.*, *Clim. Past* 8, 1-16 (2012). doi:10.5194/cp-8-1-2012
- 15 90. R. F. Keeling, "Development of an interferometric oxygen analyzer for precise measurement
 of the atmospheric O₂ mole fraction," thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
 (1988).
91. S. von Caemmerer, G. D. Farquhar, *Planta* 153, 376-387 (1981). doi:10.1007/BF00384257
92. M. N. Woillez *et al.*, *Clim. Past* 10, 1165-1182 (2014). doi:10.5194/cp-10-1165-2014
- 20 93. P. Le Mézo, L. Beaufort, L. Bopp, P. Braconnot, M. Kageyama, *Clim. Past* 13, 759-778
 (2017). doi:10.5194/cp-13-759-2017
94. M. Wang, Q. Fu, S. Solomon, R. H. White, B. Alexander, *J. Geophys. Res.* 125,
 e2020JD032929 (2020). doi:10.1029/2020JD032929
95. Q. Fu *et al.*, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 47, e2019GL086271 (2020). doi :10.1029/2019GL086271
- 25 96. M. Abalos *et al.*, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 21, 13571-13591 (2021). doi :10.5194/acp-21-13571-
 2021
97. S. J. Eichelberger, D. L. Hartmann, *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 32, L15807 (2005).
 doi:10.1029/2005GL022924
98. R. R. Garcia. W. J. Randel, *J. Atmos. Sci.* 65, 2731-2739 (2008).
30 doi :10.1175/2008JAS2712.1
99. C. Kodama, T. Iwasaki, K. Shibata, S. Yukimoto, *J. Geophys. Res.* 112, D16103 (2007).
 doi:10.1029/2006JD008219

100. D. Rind, J. Lerner, C. McLinden, *J. Geophys. Res.* 106, 28061-28079 (2001).
doi:10.1029/2001JD000439
101. F. Li, R. S. Stolarski, P. A. Newman, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 9, 2207-2213 (2009).
doi:10.5194/acp-9-2207-2009
- 5 102. T. G. Shepherd, *Atmos. Ocean* 46, 117-138 (2008). doi:10.3137/ao.460106
103. S. R. Hall *et al.*, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 18, 16809-16828 (2018). doi:10.5194/acp-18-16809-
2018
104. K. Lamy *et al.*, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* 19, 10087-10110 (2019). doi :10.5194/acp-19-10087-
2019
- 10 105. R. S. Stolarski, A. R. Douglass, P. A. Newman, S. Pawson, M. R. Schoeberl, *J. Clim.* 23,
28-42 (2010). doi:10.1175/2009JCLI2955.1

Acknowledgments: We are grateful to G. Teste for support in EDC ice sample cutting and transportation, and to H. Fischer for his review and constructive comments on the early version of our manuscript. We thank M. Kageyama for providing IPSL-CM5 model simulation outputs, and N. Bouttes, A. Orsi, L. Dupont, and H. Hooghiemstra for their helpful discussions. We thank the Dome C logistics teams and the drilling team that made this science possible. This work is a contribution to EPICA, a joint European Science Foundation and European Commission scientific program, funded by the European Union and by national contributions from Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. The main logistic support was provided by Institut Polaire Français Paul-Emile Victor and Programma Nazionale Ricerche in Antartide. This is EPICA publication no. xxx.

Funding: J.-W.Y. was supported by Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (2019R1A6A3A03033698). M. B. is supported by a public grant overseen by the French National Research Agency (ANR) as part of the Investissement d'Avenir program, through the IDI 2017 project funded by IDEX Paris-Saclay (ANR-11-IDEX-0003-02). The research leading to these results has received funding from the French Institute of Universe Sciences (INSU-BIOCOD), the French National Research Agency (ANR HUMI 17) and the European Research Council under the European Union H2020 Program grant agreement 817493 (ERC ICORDA).

National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) Basic Science Research Program grant 2019R1A6A3A03033698 (JWY)

French National Research Agency (ANR-11-IDEX-0003-02) (MB)

French Institute of Universe Sciences (INSU-BIOCOD) (SDA and AL)

French National Research Agency (ANR HUMI17) (AL)

European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union H2020 Program grant 817493 (ERC ICORDA) (AL)

Author contributions:

Conceptualization: JWY, MB, AL, SDA

Methodology: AL, MB, FP, JWY

Formal analysis: JWY, TB

Investigation: JWY, AL, MB, SDA, TB, TE

Visualization: JWY, MB

Funding acquisition: JWY, AL, SDA, MB

Project administration: JWY, AL

Resources: AL, FP, TB

Supervision: AL, SDA

Validation: JWY, MB, AL, TB

Writing – original draft: JWY, AL, MB

Writing – review & editing: JWY, AL, SDA, MB, TE, TB

Competing interests: Authors declare no competing interests.

Data and materials availability: New EDC ¹⁷Δ data will be made available via PANGAEA repository (65).

Supplementary Materials

5

Materials and Methods

Supplementary Text

Figs. S1 to S10

Tables S1 to S4

References (67–105)

10

Fig. 1. The 800,000-year ice-core composite of $^{17}\Delta$ records. (A) Compilation of $^{17}\Delta$ of multiple ice-core records with previously published data (8, 31, 60). The new EDC data produced in this study are plotted in blue triangles with 1-sigma uncertainty ranges. The smoothed curve of the compilation record is shown in red solid line. (B) Ice-core CO_2 compilation (grey dots) and the smoothed curve (red) (1, 2). (C) Smoothed $^{17}\Delta$ (black) and $^{17}\Delta_{\text{arb}}$ time series (red). (D) $^{17}\Delta$ offset between the two-time series in (C). (E) 20-ka moving correlation coefficient (blue) and p-values (red) between smoothed $^{17}\Delta$ and $^{17}\Delta_{\text{arb}}$ time series in (C). (F) LR04 benthic $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ stack (61). The light- and dark yellow shadings denote the negative and positive offsets within the even-numbered MIS stages as defined by (61). (G) Scatter plot between $^{17}\Delta$ and CO_2 , both smoothed by 11-kyr moving average (fig. S2). The CO_2 composite data in (B) are interpolated to the ages of $^{17}\Delta$ data. The linear regression of CO_2 to $^{17}\Delta_{\text{arb}}$ is shown in dark red. At given CO_2 , scatter points in the right (green) and the left (orange) to the regression line imply enhanced and reduced F_{bio} , respectively. (H and I) The enlarged view of (C) and (D) over MIS 16 interval. All of the plots are based on, or transferred to AICC 2012 chronology (29, 62, 63).

Fig. 2. Comparison of the reconstructed GPP-O₂ with global and regional paleoclimate records. (A) Ice-core CO₂ composite (1, 2) smoothed by 5-ka moving average. (B) GPP-O₂ reconstructed by AL (blue) and TB (pink) models. For AL model, the dark- and light blue shadings represent 68% and 95% ranges of Monte-Carlo sensitivity solutions (29). The TB model solutions for LGM C4 plant contribution of 0.7 (pink) and 0.4 (yellow) are plotted with corresponding curves with the Holocene-LGM ¹⁷O anomaly offset of 10 ppm (thin pink and thin yellow, respectively). All the model reconstructions are smoothed by 5-ka moving average. (C) RSL reconstruction (55). (D) GAST anomaly from present (0-5 ka) (54). (E) Global SST stack (9). (F) EDC dust flux (64) smoothed by 5-ka moving mean. (G) Alkenone concentration from ODP 1090 core (6). (H) Ba/Fe ratio from ODP 1094 core (20) smoothed by 5-ka moving average. (I) Ba/Al ratio at ODP 882 site (35) smoothed by 5-ka moving average. (J) Ba/Ti ratio from TT013-PC72 core (36). (K) Biogenic silica from Lake Baikal (45). (L) Arboreal pollen fraction from Lake Ohrid (brown) (43) and Tenaghi Phillippon (dark green) (42). (M) Fractional abundances of the pollen end-members at MD96-2048 core, SE Africa (44). Yellow shadings indicate the interglacial periods.

Fig. 3. Close-up of GPP-O₂ evolution during glacial intervals with different climate proxies.

(A) Ice-core $\delta^{18}\text{O}_{\text{atm}}$ composite (dark blue) (65) and DE (purple) (58). (B) GPP-O₂ reconstructions using AL and TB model in identical color schemes than in Fig. 2. (C) ice-core CO₂ composite (1, 2). (D) RSL re construction (55). (E) GAST anomaly from present (0-5 ka) (54). (F) global SST stack (9). (G) EDC dust flux (64). Blue and red shadings indicate the mid- and full-glacial stages, respectively.

5

Fig. 4. Comparison of magnitude of changes in GPP-O₂ and potential climatic controls between the two glacial stages.

The differences (expressed in Δ) between the average values of the two stages (full-glacial minus mid-glacial stages) as defined in Fig. 3. Both Δ GPP-O₂ results from AL (square) and TB (triangle) models are plotted. (A) Comparison with CO₂ changes. The grey solid line stands for the Δ GPP-O₂ predicted by second-order regression of CO₂ sensitivity simulations using ORCHIDEE model (46), assuming constant ocean productivity and terrestrial-to-marine GPP ratio. The Δ GPP-O₂ uncertainties are taken as 16 to 84 percentiles of the Monte-Carlo simulations (n=1000) of 26 sensitivity scenarios. CO₂ uncertainties are taken from (2). (B) Comparison with DE changes (58). The positive changes indicate southward displacement of tropical rainbelt. The uncertainties for Δ DE are based on the 1 σ errors reported in (58). (C) Comparison with changes in EDC dust flux (64). The positive offset implies stronger iron fertilization on SO during full-glacial stages compared to the mid-glacial. Δ Dust flux uncertainty is estimated by assuming the maximum analytical error reported as 10% (64). (D) Comparison with RSL changes (55). The Δ RSL uncertainty is based on the 1 σ uncertainty ranges in (55).