The Authors would like to thank anonymous reviewer R1 for the very helpful comments, following which we have decided to revise the manuscript in order to include more figures and discussions concerning the small-scale variability and the soluble/insoluble origin of the LA elemental signatures observed. Our replies are here in bold. Relevant changes in text and figures are illustrated at the end of this document, where added or modified text is highlighted in yellow.

1) This paper presents the application of a new high-resolution (~200 μ m) analytical technique to a period of abrupt climate change in the NGRIP ice core (actually a 2.85 m section representing about 250 years). I actually find this paper quite hard to review: on the one hand the technical achievement is good and worth documenting. On the other hand what we learn from it is minimal, and there are many more interesting things the authors could have done.

It is correct that our paper focuses on the methodology and novel calibration with one casestudy, which primarily aims at highlighting the now achievable sub-annual resolution in very deep ice cores via cryo-cell LA-ICPMS and which is not possible conventionally. On the other hand, our data do provide further evidence for an extremely abrupt mechanism that sustainably changes 'dust' proxy concentrations across Stadial-Interstadial transitions, and which – as R1 also points out – we crucially extend to this ice core depth and for such a shortlived DO event (GI.21.2 – also defined 'precursor' event after Capron et al., 2010, where conventional CFA hardly resolves such rapid changes.) Extending this to one of the earliest DO-events in conjunction with what had been observed in other DO events (Steffensen et al., 2008; Thomas et al., 2008), will eventually allow the community to edge closer to identifying a mechanism driving these changes. To study especially the early Stadial-Interstadial events, we provide both the previously unavailable tool and initial results.

2) I therefore think the authors have two choices. One alternative is that they should shorten the paper and just present it as a proof of concept. The other is that they should add to it – possibly involving new analyses but certainly new data treatments, to try to give new insights into what benefits such a technique might bring.

In keeping with our reply to point 1) we have introduced a new subsection with figures and related text that display our 2D mapping of elemental concentration at specific sample cross-sections. This contribution resulted from several parallel tracks run parallel to the main ablation tracks. It helps to clarify the spatial variability of element concentrations at the (sub)mm-scale, and therefore allows further discussions about mobility of elements and soluble/insoluble impurities.

3) The positive part is that the authors have successfully used laser ablation to determine 5 elements at 200 μ m resolution. They describe the way they cleaned the samples (partly with the laser) and the novel way in which they produced quasi-homogeneous standards. I congratulate them on this.

Thank you.

4) The headline findings from the study are not new: that dust elements change very rapidly

(annual scale) at the start of a D-O event (this was already said as far back as Fuhrer et al 1999), and that they appear to change before the water isotopes (already covered by Steffensen et al and Thomas et al). Sure, this is the oldest section on which such a finding has been confirmed, but as only one event is studied it just adds an example rather than offering a generalisation, and certainly doesn't provide evidence to make new ideas about the mechanism. Of course, this is not the authors' fault. On the other hand they could have taken the opportunity to really discuss what the advantages and drawbacks of such high resolution might be. I can suggest several lines of study they could have taken:

We consider our contribution relevant not only methodologically but also application-wise as we show – as R1 (and indeed also R2) state and acknowledge as novelties – a way to achieving sub-annually resolved data for one of the very early Greenland DO-events (or indeed for other low accumulation sites). Yes, only one, but at least one of the very early ones. We simply do not consider this manuscript space-wise to be the appropriate place to show more DOtransition data plus an extended discussion; this is planned for another contribution about to be submitted for publication.

5)

An obvious issue is how reproducible the data from such narrow tracks are. The authors say they ran parallel tracks but then do not show us the data so we can assess. I don't know how far apart the tracks were, but parallel tracks across the core at cm distances would have given a crucial clue to reproducibility, which in turn would allow a conclusion as to whether the advantages of high resolution are real (providing evidence of climate variability) or illusory (providing evidence of depositional noise).
We have added a paragraph in the methodology section addressing track

we have added a paragraph in the methodology section addressing track reproducibility, illustrated by a figure in the supplementary material (new Fig. S3) that displays two parallel tracks (2 mm apart) along three consecutive samples for a total of 15 cm. The data show that the patterns generally preserve the overall shape and the intensities maintain similar absolute values over the entire length, with local variations induced by a differential presence on the ablation track of micro-particles (possibly) or grain boundaries and triple junctions.

2. A second issue concerns diffusion. It is generally assumed that water isotopes diffuse a few cm in the firn and then also in solid ice, sulfate peaks appear to diffuse, while dust probably does not diffuse. What about these elements? Here are data apparently showing the retention of mm scale structure at 80 ka ago. This is interesting in its own right and would be even more so if compared to the structure at the start of DO events in the younger part of the record. It might even have been possible to derive diffusion coefficients, which might be crucial when investigating even older ice (eg in Antarctica). Our 2D maps outline a pattern of elevated elemental concentrations in the proximity of grain boundaries (but see also Della Lunga et al., 2014). Furthermore, 2D maps of the most soluble ('sea-salt') proxies show a closer match between the high concentrations zones and the grain boundary network. This could be ascribable to a relative difference in the source of the elemental signals, being increasingly related to randomly dispersed dust micro-particles going from Na to Fe. A quantitative treatment of diffusion coefficients goes beyond what we had intended to present in this contribution but is certainly something to be reported in a future publication as it

is contained in the PhD thesis of the first author already (DDL).

3. What is this method actually analysing and how does that compare to what CFA and IC measure? We are shown a comparison only for Na (not counting dust which cannot be compared quantitatively). Why? This seems crucial and even if the data are not yet available from the CFA for eg Ca (which is odd if Na has been measured), it would have been trivial to prepare a few 1 cm samples for IC analysis. This seems critical because Fig 5 seems to show unexpectedly poor agreement for Na, which certainly needs discussion. But in general the consideration of whether this method measures more of the insoluble component than CFA/IC would have been an important analytical discussion that could have been included.

Following on from our previous comment, we introduced further discussions of Na data and especially the differences between CFA and LA-ICPMS in terms of soluble/insoluble particles analysed. Unfortunately, high resolution Ca (CFA data) is not available for the corresponding depth interval. However, we do want to stress that this information requested by R1 is in part already contained in the original manuscript in form of Fig. S4 (now, former S3), which shows a comparison of cryo-cell-LA and solution ICPMS data.

I will discuss a few details below, but as already outlined, the issues above could be discussed; if the authors prefer not to then the paper should be cut back to an analytical proof of concept.

Detailed comments:

6) Page 2, para 1. You seem to come down on one side of an ongoing discussion about whether the cold period enhancement is mainly due to increased transport or to the presence of a sea ice source. It would better reflect the science if you left that open.

We have added a sentence clarifying that the role of salty brines or blowing snow on top of sea ice it is still a matter of debate concerning their contribution to the wintertime peak in sea salt aerosol.

7) Page 2 line 23. It gives a misleading impression to state that rge resolution is "nominally…weekly" because precipitation intermittency and snowdrift mean that weekly resolution is certainly not available. I suspect you know that with your use of the word "nominally", and you should explain that.

We changed the expression to "50 data points per year", avoiding the misleading impression.

8) Page 3, line 1. You say that the section "covers" GI21.2, and then give an age range of 370 year (84.70-85.07 ka) for that. But in the abstract you refer to it as a 250 year section, even though Fig 1 shows that it is actually wider than GI21.2. This is incompatible – please correct. The ages of GI21.2 have now been corrected and clarified. Sorry for the confusion and thanks for pointing out the inconsistency.

9) Page 3, line 16. Sorry to be picky but you cite Fig 5 before Figs 2-4. This sentence has been moved towards the end of the methodology section.

10) Eq 1 and line 25 is confusing. If I understand it m_i is the slope of intensity vs time, whereas your wording made me think it was the slope of the calibration (intensity vs standard concentration). Please clarify. I think Fig 1 would be better shown as linear rather than log plots, as the log plot hides the extent of the drift.

We have added in brackets the reference to Fig S1 to clarify that the m_{std_i} coefficient refers to the slope of instrumental drift. This figure was changed and now shows a linear y-axis.

11) Page 4, line 25. Is this the R² of lin-lin or log-log plots? You show log plots but then describe it as a linear regression. Please clarify.

R² and linear regression slopes were calculated from lin-lin plots. The plot utilizes log-log axis for the sake of display only. It has been now clarified in the text how the R² values and slope coefficient were derived.

12) Page 4, line 31. Here is where you say you analysed two parallel tracks to assess reproducibility but then you never do so.

New Fig S3 now displays two parallel tracks on three consecutive samples to assess reproducibility. A paragraph in the text was added to illustrate the figure.

13) Results, page 5-6, seems repetitive (last para page 5 and first para page 6). Combine them into something clearer?

The Results section has been revised; we removed some of the repetition in the first part and added a paragraph towards the end to describe the figures added after this revision.

14) Page 6, line 9, should be Figs 6 and 7 not 8 and 9. Noted and changed.

15) Page 6, data comparison, lines 27-32. It is clearly not true that Na is comparable between the two techniques. While they match OK at 2689.7-2690.0, they are at least a factor 3 off in the shallower section. This needs a better and more correct discussion. (And of course I would like to see the same for Ca).

Discussion concerning Na data and soluble/insoluble origin of 'sea-salt' and 'dust' proxies has been added to address some of the discrepancy between CFA and LA-data and what can be concluded from that.

References

Della Lunga, D., Muller, W., Rasmussen, S. O., and Svensson, A. (2014). Location of cation impurities in NGRIP deep ice revealed by cryo-cell UV-laser-ablation ICPMS. Journal of Glaciology, 60(223).

Thomas, E. R., Wolff, E. W., Mulvaney, R., Johnsen, S. J., Steffensen, J. P., and Arrowsmith, C. (2009). Anatomy of a Dansgaard-Oeschger warming transition: High-resolution analysis of the north Greenland ice core project ice core. Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres, 114, D08102.

Steffensen, J. P., Andersen, K. K., Bigler, M., Clausen, H. B., Dahl-Jensen, D., Fischer, H., Goto-Azuma K., Hansson M., Johnsen S. J., Jouzel J., Masson-Delmotte V., Popp T., Rasmussen S. O, R. Röthlisberger R., Ruth U., Stauffer B., Siggaard-Andersen M. L., Sveinbjörnsdóttir Á. E., Svensson A., White, J. W. C. (2008). High-resolution Greenland ice core data show abrupt climate change happens in few years. Science, 321(5889), 680-684.

Post Review changes to:

Calibrated cryo-cell UV-LA-ICPMS elemental concentrations from NGRIP ice core reveal abrupt, subannual variability in dust across the interstadial period GI-21.2

Damiano Della Lunga¹, Wolfgang Müller¹, Sune Olander Rasmussen², Anders Svensson², Paul Vallelonga²

¹Department of Earth Sciences, Royal Holloway University of London, Egham TW20 0EX, United Kingdom

 2 Centre for Ice and Climate, Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, 2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark

Introduction

[.....] This mechanism, which is thought to be the primary reason for sea-salt enrichment in ice cores during cooling events, receives further contributions of sea salt from another source. When sea ice is formed, highly saline brine and fragile frost flowers form on top of the frozen surface. This brine represents a further source of aerosol, carried over land by the wind (Wolff et al, 2003). However, a quantitative assessment of the contribution of brine, frost flowers, and blowing snow to the wintertime peak in sea salt aerosol it is still a matter of debate (Huang and Jaegle, 2016).

[.....]The aim of the present study is to assess the sensitivity and the phasing of dust/sea-salt proxies as Na⁺, Fe²⁺, Al³⁺, Ca²⁺ and Mg²⁺ at a resolution of ~200 μ m (providing approximately 50 data points per calendar year at this depth) across the abrupt warming into and cooling out of the precursor event GI-21.2. Furthermore, we present an updated fully quantitative calibration for the elements under investigation, following Della Lunga et al. (2014) and Müller et al. (2011).

Methods and Calibration

This section corresponds to more than two hundred years, given the observed layer thickness of ~10 mm (Vallelonga et al., 2012). In the flow-model-based GICC05modelext timescale, the section covers an age range of 85.09 - 84.86 ka b2k and includes the 100-year long GI-21.2 and the transitions in and out of this period (Wolff et al., 2010; Rasmussen et al., 2014). We utilized samples from a similar position within the ice core cross section as in Della Lunga et al. (2014).

[.....] The adopted methodology includes the acquisition of the following mass/charge ratios: 23(Na), 24(Mg), 27(Al), 34(S), 39(K), 40(Ca), 44(Ca), 55(Mn), 56(Fe), 65(Cu), 85(Rb), 88(Sr), 89(Y), 138(Ba), 139(La), 140(Ce), 141(Pr), 147(Sm), 153(Eu), 157(Gd), 172(Yb), 208(Pb), with dwell times ranging from 5 to 40 ms (see Della Lunga et al., 2014), and a total sweep time of 550 ms. Among these, only the following usually show resolvable signal/background ratio and will be displayed as results: 24(Mg), 27(Al), 40(Ca), 56(Fe). All elements were acquired in *reaction* mode, utilizing 4.5 ml/min of H_2 in the octopole cell, allowing the removal of conventional plasma interferences via charge transfer reaction, particularly

significant on mass 40(Ca) and 56(Fe) from ⁴⁰Ar and ⁴⁰Ar¹⁶O. Mass 39(K), despite resolvable signal/background ratio, is affected by a potentially significant interference of ³⁸ArH resulting from adding H_2 in the reaction cell, and therefore will not be considered further. Formation of other hydrides has been monitored on specific isobaric-free masses (210, 233) in no gas and H_2 mode and resulted in no significant formation of such compounds in both cases. Rare Earth Elements were monitored as indicator of further possible contamination due to smoothing and were not the main target of this study.

[....] Each element has been externally calibrated using a set of four custom-made ice standards chosen from a total of five (SLRS-5, SLRS-5_10, ICP-20, NIST1648a and Water Low), prepared at RHUL from four different standard solutions at different concentrations and different dilutions (Table S1, see supplementary material). All of our Ice standards except SLRS-5 were prepared by dilution between 1:10 and 1:1000 of the certified reference material with ultrapure H_2O (>18 M Ω ·cm); we very mildly acidified these solutions with 1% ultrapure HNO3 to stabilize them before freezing and to align them with the acidity of the multi-elemental standard solution ICP1 (Sigma-Aldrich), which was the only one being originally (before dilution) in 10% HNO₃, unlike all of our other standard solutions.

This external calibration assumes overall comparable ablation characteristics of NGRIP ice and ice standards, which in view of their similar matrix are a satisfactory assumption. Furthermore, using m/z=17 (OH) as an internal standard following Reinhardt et al. (2003), is not feasible because the significantly lower sample consumption of UV-LA relative to IR-LA (Müller et al., 2011) does not result in a background-resolved ICPMS signal at m/z=17.

[....] For each element, the slope of the equation of the regression line fitting all four standards in the linear plot has been calculated (together with the corresponding R^2 value) and utilized to convert net-intensities into concentrations. For the sake of display Fig. 4 show all the regression lines in a log-log plot.

Results

[....]Figures 9 and 10 show a collection of maps of calibrated concentrations of the elements under investigation from a 4x4 mm cross section at depth of 2689.78 and 2689.55 m. These sections were chosen specifically from depths were concentrations were high and presented a considerable degree of small scale variability as inferred from our laser ablation profiles.

LA-ICPMS-CFA data comparison

For comparison, our cryo-cell LA-ICPMS data have been plotted together in Fig 5-8 with previously published CFA results from the same NGRIP depths (Vallelonga et al., 2012). In contrast to the cryo-cell LA-ICPMS resolution of ~0.2 mm, the CFA profiles of Na, δ^{18} O, CFA-dust and conductivity have a resolution of 3.5, 50, 1.5 and 1.5 mm respectively. The two datasets show some similarities: between a depth of 2691.50 and 2691.20 m the dust, and partly also the conductivity profiles present relatively high values, similar to what is observed for our elemental proxies, typical of the stadial GS-22 phase. At 2691.20 CFA-dust and LA data are both characterized by a decrease in concentrations, although the LA data show much clearer and abrupt features, marking the start of the GI-21.2 warm phase. Furthermore, minima for

the entire section are located between depths of 2690.95 and 2690.15 m in both datasets. Also, both datasets agree in the shallowest part of the section, showing a more increasing trend starting at 2690.00 m.

In Fig.5, Na data from CFA and LA-ICPMS analyses have been plotted together on the same y-scale. The two datasets show overall analogous patterns in most of the section and in some sections broadly comparable average values, such as between 2690.00 – 2689.25 m (70 ppb and 67 ppb in the CFA and LA-ICPMS profile, respectively). However, LA-ICPMS-Na characteristically is more variable and differs from CFA data in the intervals 2689.20 – 2688.65 m and 2691.5 – 2691.5 m, where LA-ICPMS Na is either higher or lower relative to CFA-Na, respectively. This seems to indicate that there is not an overall systematic shift between the two techniques (see below). In general, the difference between LA-Na and CFA-Na, could derive from the tendency of Na to show higher concentrations in the proximity of grain boundaries and junctions, as it is described in the following section. Therefore, laser ablation tracks show much higher variability as a result of scanning across several boundaries and junctions at small scale, introducing a factor of differentiation that is also reflected in our calibration since it reduces the homogeneity of our ice standards.

As a further test, we compared the cryo-cell UV-LA-ICPMS data acquired in the frozen state with results from the same three NGRIP samples analysed via solution-ICPMS after melting (10 ml). The three samples correspond to three different depths in the immediate vicinity of GI-21.2 and representing a wide range of concentrations: early GS-22 (sample 4940A11), late GS-22 (sample 4900A3) and GI-21.1 (sample 4882B4). Results show that calibrated solution data are consistent with our LA-ICPMS data and differ by 5 -20 %, which is essentially within our margin of error. Sample 4882B4, representing the last part of GS-21.2, shows the lowest concentrations amongst the three samples and also the consistently largest differences between solution and laser data (see Fig. S4 in the supplementary material).

Origin of Laser ablation elemental signal

The intensity of the LA-signal associated to a certain mass/charge ratio, characteristic to one element, is built up by two different contributions: one from soluble ions present in the ice matrix and the other one from dispersed insoluble mineral particles containing the element in their structure. Micro-particles in the NGRIP ice core have a mean grain size between 1 and 2 μ m (Ruth et al., 2003) and therefore are too small to be identified unequivocally with our laser camera. Visual inspection of the sample before, after, and during ablation indicated that no residual spatter of the ablation process was deposited back onto the ice surface after the laser hit the sample, indicating a complete digestion of the material removed by the ablation pulses. This suggests that no fractionation between soluble and insoluble particle is taking place by effect of the laser sampling.

We investigated the spatial distribution of Na, Mg, Al, Ca and Fe over two small horizontal planes (i.e, perpendicular to the core length axis) by analysing 2D maps of concentrations across two of these specific cross sections (Fig 9 and 10). These sections were constructed interpolating several acquisition points obtained via static laser drilling. Fig 9 and 10 both show concentrations spanning over a range of several tens of ppb for each element across the entire sections. The cross-sections intersect few grain boundaries and junctions (as observable in the laser camera image). The grain boundary net has been overlaid in black onto the elemental maps and shows that, in most of the cases, high concentrations areas are located in the

proximity of boundaries and junction, broadly mimicking their pattern. In both cases, these patterns are somehow clearer for element like Na and Mg, related to sea salt, and become less defined going from Ca to Al and Fe. This might be associated with the fact that the elemental signal has a relative increasing contribution from micro-particles going from Ca to Al, to Fe, whereas the contribution from micro-particles to the Na and Mg signal would be minimal. This would also suggest that micro-particles are slightly less inclined to be aligned on boundaries and junctions compared to soluble impurities and therefore generate a less defined pattern of concentrations in our maps.

Discussion

[....] Most of the differences between CFA and LA-ICPMS proxies are observed at a small scale and are mainly influenced by few factors, the first of which is the effect of sample volume. In fact, we estimate that every LA-ICPMS data point corresponds to ~120 ng of ablated ice (based on scanning speed and ice crater depth) whereas CFA sampling resolution is about 0.1-1 g for each data point (Vallelonga et al., 2012). This introduces a difference in the sampling volume between the two datasets that can also be influenced by surface effects and especially by the wavy nature of layers at this scale and core depth. This is particularly important for Na, whose lateral variability induced by any non-horizontal layering is also affected by diffusion of Na that has been observed at this depth, resulting in a smoothing of the CFA annual signal (Vallelonga et al., 2012). Furthermore, the CFA insoluble dust data presented here refer to measurements of particles of size >1 μ m and therefore do not account for insoluble impurities of sub-micron size (Vallelonga et al., 2012).

The elemental maps shown in Fig. 9 and 10 demonstrate that, at sub-cm scale, the concentrations of impurities it is strongly influenced by the presence of boundaries and junctions even when considering horizontal planes, whose original impurity-input is therefore assumed to be roughly identical. This introduces a main source of differentiation between LA and CFA sampling and can account for some of the small-scale variability we observe in the LA-profiles. This is particularly relevant for element like Na and Mg whose 2D distribution seems to follow closely the grain boundary net, presenting higher concentrations in the proximity of boundary and junction. On the other hand, 'dust'-proxies as Ca, Al and Fe, do not show such a closer overlap of high intensity and presence of boundaries or junctions, possibly as a result of being increasingly associated with insoluble micro-particles dispersed in the ice matrix, which indeed constitutes the CFA-Dust signal. This suggests that micro-particles in the ice matrix are less inclined to reside on boundaries and junction compared to soluble ions and is consistent with previous studies of deep ice cores (Della Lunga et al., 2014; Eichler et al., 2016). As a result, the averaging of LA-signal between two or more parallel tracks spaced by few mm is not only desirable but necessary.

Author contribution

DDL designed the experiment, performed the analysis, interpreted the data and wrote the manuscript. WM helped designing the experiment, performing the analysis and the data interpretation and edited the manuscript. SOR and AS contributed to the designing of the experiment, the sample preparation, the data

interpretation and edited the manuscript. PV provided CFA data for comparison, helped with the data interpretation and edited the manuscript.

Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by a RHUL studentship granted to Damiano Della Lunga, with the analytical costs being co-funded initially via a research grant from Resonetics LLC & Laurin Technic to Wolfgang Müller, and subsequently via a Postdoctoral grant from Australian Scientific Instruments (ASI) to both Damiano Della Lunga and Wolfgang Müller. The authors would like to thank Jerry Morris for continuing invaluable technical support at RHUL. Initial discussions with Michael Kriews and Dorothee Wilhelms-Dick helped to improve the methodology of ice standard preparation.

References

Barker, S., Chen, J., Gong, X., Jonkers, L., Knorr, G., & Thornalley, D. (2015). Icebergs not the trigger for North Atlantic cold events. Nature, 520(7547), 333-336.

Berglund, M., and Wieser, M. E. (2011). Isotopic compositions of the elements 2009 (IUPAC Technical Report). Pure and Applied Chemistry, 83(2), 397-410.

Bigler, M., Svensson, A., Kettner, E., Vallelonga, P., Nielsen, M. E., & Steffensen, J. P. (2011). Optimization of high-resolution continuous flow analysis for transient climate signals in ice cores. Environmental science & technology, 45(10), 4483-4489.

Boch, R., Cheng, H., Spötl, C., Edwards, R. L., Wang, X., and Häuselmann, P. (2011). NALPS: a precisely dated European climate record 120–60 ka. Climate of the Past, 7(4), 1247-1259.

Broecker, W., Bond, G., Klas, M., Clark, E., & McManus, J. (1992). Origin of the northern Atlantic's Heinrich events. Climate Dynamics, 6(3-4), 265-273.

Broecker, W. S. (2003). Does the trigger for abrupt climate change reside in the ocean or in the atmosphere?. Science, 300(5625), 1519-1522.

Capron, E., A. Landais, J. Chappellaz, A. Schilt, D. Buiron, Dahl-Jensen D., Johnsen S.J., Jouzel J., Lemieux-Dudon B., Loulergue L., Leuenberger M., Masson-Delmotte V., Meyer H., Oerter H., Stenni B. "Millennial and sub-millennial scale climatic variations recorded in polar ice cores over the last glacial period." Climate of the Past 6, 3 (2010): 345-365.

Clark, P. U., Pisias, N. G., Stocker, T. F., & Weaver, A. J. (2002). The role of the thermohaline circulation in abrupt climate change. Nature, 415(6874), 863-869.

Clement, A. C., Cane, M. A., & Seager, R. (2001). An Orbitally Driven Tropical Source for Abrupt Climate Change. Journal of Climate, 14(11), 2369-2375.

Clement, A. C., & Peterson, L. C. (2008). Mechanisms of abrupt climate change of the last glacial period. Reviews of Geophysics, 46(4).

Dansgaard, Willi, S. J. Johnsen, H. B. Clausen, D. Dahl-Jensen, N. S. Gundestrup, C. U. Hammer, C. S. Hvidberg, Steffensen J.P., Svelnbjornsdottir A.E., Jouzel J., Bond G. (1993): "Evidence for general instability of past climate from a 250-kyr ice-core record." Nature, 364, no. 6434 218-220.

Della Lunga, D., Muller, W., Rasmussen, S. O., and Svensson, A. (2014). Location of cation impurities in NGRIP deep ice revealed by cryo-cell UV-laser-ablation ICPMS. Journal of Glaciology, 60(223).

Deplazes, G., Lückge, A., Peterson, L. C., Timmermann, A., Hamann, Y., Hughen, K. A., Röhl U., Laj C., Cane M. A., Sigman D.M., Haug, G. H. (2013). Links between tropical rainfall and North Atlantic climate during the last glacial period. Nature Geoscience, 6(3), 213-217.

Eichler, J., Kleitz, I., Bayer, M., Jansen, D., Kipfstuhl, S., Shigeyama, W., Weikusat, C., and Weikusat, I. (2016): Location and distribution of micro-inclusions in the EDML and NEEM ice cores using optical microscopy and in-situ Raman spectroscopy, The Cryosphere Discuss., in review.

Fuhrer, K., Wolff, E. W., and Johnsen, S. J. (1999). Timescales for dust variability in the Greenland Ice Core Project (GRIP) ice core in the last 100,000 years. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres (1984–2012), 104(D24), 31043-31052.

Gillette, D. A., and Passi, R. (1988). Modeling dust emission caused by wind erosion. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres (1984–2012), 93(D11), 14233-14242.

Grachev, A. M., Brook, E. J., Severinghaus, J. P., and Pisias, N. G. (2009). Relative timing and variability of atmospheric methane and GISP2 oxygen isotopes between 68 and 86 ka. Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 23(2).

Grootes, P. M., and Stuiver, M. (1997). Oxygen 18/16 variability in Greenland snow and ice with 10– 3-to 105-year time resolution. Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans (1978–2012), 102(C12), 26455-26470.

Huang, J., & Jaeglé, L. (2016) Wintertime enhancements of sea salt aerosol in polar regions consistent with a sea-ice source from blowing snow. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, in review.

Huber, C., Leuenberger, M., Spahni, R., Fluckiger, J., Schwander, J., Stocker, T. F., Johnsen S., Landais A., Jouzel, J. (2006). Isotope calibrated greenland temperature record over marine isotope stage 3 and its relation to CH4. Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 243(3-4), 504-519.

Jochum, K. P., Weis, U., Stoll, B., Kuzmin, D., Yang, Q., Raczek, I., Jacob D.E., Stracke A., Birbaum K., Frick D. A., Günther D., and Enzweiler, J. (2011). Determination of reference values for NIST SRM 610–617 glasses following ISO guidelines. Geostandards and Geoanalytical Research, 35(4), 397-429.

Johnsen, S. J., Clausen, H. B., Dansgaard, W., Fuhrer, K., Gundestrup, N., Hammer, C. U., Iversen P., Jouzel J., Stauffer B., Steffensen, J. P. (1992). Irregular glacial interstadials recorded in a new Greenland ice core. Nature, 359(6393), 311-313.

Kreutz, K.J., and Koffman, B., (2013), Glaciochemistry, in Encyclopedia of Quaternary Science 2nd edition, S. Elias, ed., Elsevier Publishers, 326-333.

Kutzbach, J. E., Guetter, P. J., Behling, P. J., and Selin, R. (1993). Simulated climatic changes: results of the COHMAP climate-model experiments. Global climates since the last glacial maximum, 24-93.

Lewis, E. R., & Schwartz, S. E. (2004). Sea salt aerosol production: mechanisms, methods, measurements, and models-A critical review. American Geophysical Union, 2004.

MacAyeal, D. R. (1993). Binge/purge oscillations of the Laurentide ice sheet as a cause of the North Atlantic's Heinrich events. Paleoceanography, 8(6), 775-784.

Mahowald, N., Kohfeld, K., Hansson, M., Balkanski, Y., Harrison, S. P., Prentice, I. C., Schulz M., Rodhe, H. (1999). Dust sources and deposition during the last glacial maximum and current climate: A comparison

of model results with paleodata from ice cores and marine sediments. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 104(D13), 15895-15916.

Masson-Delmotte, V., Jouzel J., Landais A., Stievenard M., Johnsen S.J., White J. W. C., Werner M., Sveinbjornsdottir A., Fuhrer K (2005). "GRIP deuterium excess reveals rapid and orbital-scale changes in Greenland moisture origin." Science 309, no. 5731 (2005): 118-121.

Müller, W., Shelley, M., Miller, P., and Broude, S. (2009). Initial performance metrics of a new customdesigned ArF excimer LA-ICPMS system coupled to a two-volume laser-ablation cell. Journal of Analytical Atomic Spectrometry, 24(2), 209-214.

Müller, W., Shelley, J. M. G., and Rasmussen, S. O. (2011). Direct chemical analysis of frozen ice cores by UV-laser ablation ICPMS. Journal of Analytical Atomic Spectrometry, 26(12), 2391-2395.

Petersen, S. V., Schrag, D. P., & Clark, P. U. (2013). A new mechanism for Dansgaard-Oeschger cycles. Paleoceanography, 28(1), 24-30.

Petit, J. R., Jouzel, J., Raynaud, D., Barkov, N. I., Barnola, J. M., Basile, I, M. Bender, J., Chappellaz, M. Davis, G. Delaygue, M. Delmotte, V. M. Kotlyakov, M. Legrand, V. Y. Lipenkov, C. Lorius, L. PÉpin, C. Ritz, E. Saltzman and Stievenard, M. (1999). Climate and atmospheric history of the past 420,000 years from the Vostok ice core, Antarctica. Nature, 399(6735), 429-436.

Randall, D.A., R.A. Wood, S. Bony, R. Colman, T. Fichefet, J. Fyfe, V. Kattsov, A. Pitman, J. Shukla, J. Srinivasan, R.J. Stouffer, A. Sumi and K.E. Taylor, (2007). Climate Models and Their Evaluation. In: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M.Tignor and H.L. Miller (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA.

Rasmussen, S. O., Bigler, M., Blockley, S. P., Blunier, T., Buchardt, S. L., Clausen, H. B. and Winstrup, M. (2014). A stratigraphic framework for abrupt climatic changes during the Last Glacial period based on three synchronized Greenland ice-core records: refining and extending the INTIMATE event stratigraphy. Quaternary Science Reviews. volume 106, 14–28.

Reinhardt, H., Kriews, M., Miller, H., Lüdke, C., Hoffmann, E., & Skole, J. (2003). Application of LA–ICP–MS in polar ice core studies. Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry, 375(8), 1265-1275.

Ruth, U., Wagenbach, D., Steffensen, J. P., & Bigler, M. (2003). Continuous record of microparticle concentration and size distribution in the central Greenland NGRIP ice core during the last glacial period. Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, 10.

Seierstad, I. K., Abbott, P. M., Bigler, M., Blunier, T., Bourne, A. J., Brook, E., Buchardt S. L., Buizert C., Clausen H. B., Cook E., Dahl-Jensen D., Davies S. M., Guillevic M., Johnsen S. J., Pedersen D. S., Popp T. J, Rasmussen S. O., Severinghaus J. P., Svensson A. & Vinther, B. M. (2014). Consistently dated records from the Greenland GRIP, GISP2 and NGRIP ice cores for the past 104 ka reveal regional millennial-scale δ 18 O gradients with possible Heinrich event imprint. Quaternary Science Reviews, 106, 29-46.

Severinghaus, J. P., and Brook, E. J. (1999). Abrupt climate change at the end of the last glacial period inferred from trapped air in polar ice. Science, 286(5441), 930-934.

Sneed, S. B., Mayewki, P. A., Sayre, W., Handley, M. J., Kurbatov, A. V., Taylor, K. C., Bohleber P., Wagenbach D., Erhardt T., Spaulding, N. E. (2015). Instruments and Methods New LA-ICP-MS cryocell and calibration technique for sub-millimeter analysis of ice cores. Journal of Glaciology, 61(226), 233.

Spötl, C., & Mangini, A. (2002). Stalagmite from the Austrian Alps reveals Dansgaard–Oeschger events during isotope stage 3: Implications for the absolute chronology of Greenland ice cores. Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 203(1), 507-518.

Steffensen, J. P., Andersen, K. K., Bigler, M., Clausen, H. B., Dahl-Jensen, D., Fischer, H., Goto-Azuma K., Hansson M., Johnsen S. J., Jouzel J., Masson-Delmotte V., Popp T., Rasmussen S. O, R. Röthlisberger R., Ruth U., Stauffer B., Siggaard-Andersen M. L., Sveinbjörnsdóttir Á. E., Svensson A., White, J. W. C. (2008). High-resolution Greenland ice core data show abrupt climate change happens in few years. Science, 321(5889), 680-684.

Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, L.V. Alexander, S.K. Allen, N.L. Bindoff, F.-M. Bréon, J.A. Church, U. Cubasch, S. Emori, P. Forster, P. Friedlingstein, N. Gillett, J.M. Gregory, D.L. Hartmann, E. Jansen, B. Kirtman, R. Knutti, K. Krishna Kumar, P. Lemke, J. Marotzke, V. Masson-Delmotte, G.A. Meehl, I.I. Mokhov, S. Piao, V. Ramaswamy, D. Randall, M. Rhein, M. Rojas, C. Sabine, D. Shindell, L.D. Talley, D.G. Vaughan and S.-P. Xie, 2013: Technical Summary. In: Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, pp. 33–115,

Svensson, A., Nielsen, S. W., Kipfstuhl, S., Johnsen, S. J., Steffensen, J. P., Bigler, M., Ruth, U., Rothlisberger, R. (2005). Visual stratigraphy of the north Greenland ice core project (NorthGRIP) ice core during the last glacial period. Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres, 110(D2), D02108.

Thomas, E. R., Wolff, E. W., Mulvaney, R., Johnsen, S. J., Steffensen, J. P., and Arrowsmith, C. (2009). Anatomy of a Dansgaard-Oeschger warming transition: High-resolution analysis of the north Greenland ice core project ice core. Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmospheres, 114, D08102.

Vallelonga, P., Bertagna, G., Blunier, T., Kjaer, H. A., Popp, T. J., Rasmussen, S. O., Stowasser C., Svensson A. S., Winstrup M., Kipfstuhl, S. (2012). Duration of Greenland stadial 22 and ice-gas Δ age from counting of annual layers in Greenland NGRIP ice core. Climate of the Past Discussions, 8(4), 2583-2605.

Voelker, A. H. (2002). Global distribution of centennial-scale records for Marine Isotope Stage (MIS) 3: a database. Quaternary Science Reviews, 21(10), 1185-1212.

Wang, Y. J., Cheng, H., Edwards, R. L., An, Z. S., Wu, J. Y., Shen, C. C., & Dorale, J. A. (2001). A high-resolution absolute-dated late Pleistocene monsoon record from Hulu Cave, China. Science, 294(5550), 2345-2348.

Wilhelm-Dick, D. (2008). Enhanced analysis of stratified climate archives through upgrade of Laser Ablation Inductively Coupled Plasma Quadrupole to Time of Flight Mass Spectrometry? (Doctoral dissertation, Berlin, Univ., Diss.).

Wolff, E. W., Rankin, A. M., and Röthlisberger, R. (2003). An ice core indicator of Antarctic sea ice production? Geophysical Research Letters, 30(22).

Wolff, E. W., Chappellaz, J., Blunier, T., Rasmussen, S. O., & Svensson, A. (2010). Millennial-scale variability during the last glacial: The ice core record. Quaternary Science Reviews, 29(21), 2828-2838. Yung, Y. L., Lee, T., Wang, C. H., & Shieh, Y. T. (1996). Dust: A diagnostic of the hydrologic cycle

during the Last Glacial Maximum. Science, 271(5251), 962-963. Zhang, X. Y., Arimoto, R., & An, Z. S. (1997). Dust emission from Chinese desert sources linked to variations in atmospheric circulation. Journal of Geophysical Research. D. Atmospheres, 102, 28-041.

Zhang, X., Lohmann, G., Knorr, G., & Purcell, C. (2014). Abrupt glacial climate shifts controlled by ice sheet changes. Nature. 512, 290–294

Figures Captions



Figure 1: δ^{18} O profile across the transition from GS-22 to GI-21.1 (modified from Vallelonga et al., 2012). Stadial and interstadial periods are highlighted in blue and red, respectively. The black box and arrow indicate the corresponding section of ice core analysed for this study.



Figure 2: Ice standard preparation at RHUL. a) 1 ml of aqueous standard solution is pipetted into the inner volume of a PTFE mould featuring a removable glass surface at the bottom to allow the solution to spread uniformly creating a thin layer of water. b) The mould is dipped into liquid nitrogen to instantaneously shock-freeze the solution. This procedure is repeated five times to build up an ice volume by shock-freezing layer by layer of 5 ml total volume resulting in an ice volume approximately 45x10x10 mm. Each ice standard was then surface-cleaned using our PTFE vice before analysis (see text).



Figure 3: Example of raw intensity data of NIST612 glass (first and last peak) compared to one of the ice standards prepared for this study (ICP-20). Standard data were acquired following three cleaning runs, and show that the ice standard appears rather homogeneous with typical RSD values between \pm 10 and 15 %. See text for details.



Figure 4: Calibration lines for elements under investigation obtained utilizing the ice standards listed in Table S1 (supplementary material). LOD indicates limits of detection. See text for details.



Figure 5: Cryo-cell-LA-ICPMS element concentration profiles of Na, Mg, Al, Ca, and Fe and corresponding Na, δ^{18} O and CFA-dust profiles at 3.5, 50 and 1.5 mm resolution respectively (the latter three from Vallelonga et al., 2012) across 2.85 m of NGRIP ice core that spans from approximately 85090 to 84860 a b2k (±20 a) and contains GI-21.2. The coloured lines are individual LA-ICPMS data points; black lines represent adjacent-element moving average (period 200). It should be noted that cryo-cell-LA-ICPMS Na LOD is 48.3 ppb, which renders most of the interstadial and some stadial Na data undetectable. Overall, Na is mainly shown to allow some comparability with existing CFA Na data (Vallelonga et al., 2012). See text for details.



Figure 6: Zoomed-in cryo-cell LA-ICPMS profiles of a 200 mm window from the deepest part of the GI-21.2 section (cold/warm transition), analysed for the most significant elements and spanning about two decades around 85.1 ka b2k. Coloured lines represent LA data, black lines are 30-points moving averages. A switch between stadial and interstadial typical concentrations is observable around 2691.20 m, happening over the space of just ~10 mm. Conductivity and CFA-dust are from Vallelonga et al. (2012).



Figure 7: Zoomed-in cryo-cell LA-ICPMS profiles of a 300 mm window from the middle part of the GI-21.2 section analysed for the most significant elements and spanning about two decades around 85.0 ka b2k (cold-warm transition). Coloured lines represent LA data, black lines are 30-points moving averages. A gradual increase in dustiness is observable starting from a depth of 2689.95 m going towards shallower depths, representing the GI-21.2 – GS-21.2 transition, which in this case takes place over the space of ~150 mm. Conductivity and CFA-dust are from Vallelonga et al. (2012).



Figure 8: CFA conductivity, CFA dust, LA-Fe, LA-Ca, LA-Al and LA-Mg direct comparison across a detailed 3cm zoom. In this case, laser ablation data have not been smoothed. Conductivity and CFA-dust are from Vallelonga et al. (2012). The profiles show sub-annual variations that contribute to the CFA annual signal.



Laser camera image





Figure 9: 2D maps of calibrated concentrations of elements under investigation (Na, Mg, Ca, Al, Fe) across a 4x4 mm cross section with overlaid grain boundary net in black as observed in transmitted light (upper right) from a depth of 2689.78 m.



Figure 10: 2D maps of calibrated concentrations of elements under investigation (Na, Mg, Ca, Al, Fe) across a 4x4 mm cross section with overlaid grain boundary net in black as observed in transmitted light (upper right) from a depth of 2689.65 m.

Supplementary material



Figure S1: LA-ICPMS instrumental drift correction. The data points represent NIST612 values acquired in between the ice samples during a single run (axes are color-coded). Sensitivity typically decreases slightly during the analysis and the slope of each element's regression line has been utilized to correct instrumental drift according to eq.1 (See text for details).



Figure S2: UV-LA-ICPMS analysis of an ice blank. The analysis includes three passages of the laser with 280 μ m spot size, 25 Hz repetition rate and 8 mm/min speed, while the last acquisition track has been performed with 212 μ m spot size, 20 Hz repetition rate and 3 mm/min speed where no analytes are above ICPMS background anymore. Analytes are the most abundant isotopes for each element. Table 1 lists the calibrated concentration (in ppb) of the major elements under investigation in the ultrapure water utilized to create ice blanks. See text for details.



Figure S3: Reproducibility of LA tracks: example of raw intensities (cps) of main elements from 2 mm apart parallel ablation tracks acquired over 15 cm (3 samples) between depths of 2691.45-2691.30 m (left to right).



Figure S4: Comparison between solution data and cryo-cell UV-LA-ICPMS data on three different samples corresponding to three different 50-mm depth intervals: 4940A11 (depth range: 2716.45 - 2716.50 m), 4900A3 (depth range: 2694.85 - 2694.90 m) and 4882B4 (depth range: 2684.875 - 2684.925 m), representing small sections of early GS-22, late GS-22 and GI-21.1, respectively. Results show that LA and solution data differ of only 5 - 20% and therefore are within error margins. See text for details.

Table S1: Concentration of elements under investigation in aqueous reference materials used for ice standard preparation: SLRS-5-"River water reference material for trace metals" (National Research Council of Canada, diluted 10 times [SLRS-5_10] when not specified), Water low (RHUL internal standard), 90243 Multi-element standard solution 1 for ICP (Sigma Aldrich, diluted 20 times), and NIST SRM 1648 Urban Particulate reference material (in suspension, see text for details). Blank concentrations (in ppb) of ultrapure water at RHUL were obtained in solution mode and are shown on the right column. Limit of detection (LOD) refer to cryo-cell LA-ICPMS analyses only.

	Standard name					
	SLRS-5_10	ICP-20	Water Low	NIST1648a		RHUL Deionized water
Element	concentration (ppb)	concentration (ppb)	concentration (ppb)	concentration (ppb)	LODs LA- ICPMS (ppb)	(ррb)
AI	4.95 ± 0.5 49.5 ± 4.8 (SLRS-5)	2525±2.5	9.8±0.1	1683±16	1.12	0.012
Fe	9.1 ± 0.6 91 ±6 (SLRS-5)	505±0.5	9.8±0.1	1924±20	1.06	0.627
Ca	1050 ± 40 10510±380 (SLRS-5)	505±0.5	48.9±0.3	3126±15	0.63	0.606
Mg	254 ± 16 2541±155 (SLRS-5)	505±0.5	48.9±0.3	394±5	0.92	0.021
Na	538 ± 10 5380±105 (SLRS-5)	2525±2.5	244±1.5	209±4	48.3	-