Separating isotopic impacts of karst and in-cave processes from climate variability using an integrated speleothem isotope-enabled forward model
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Abstract. Speleothem $\delta^{18}$O values are commonly used to infer past climate variability. However, both non-linear karst hydrological processes and in-cave disequilibrium isotope fractionation are recognised and hinder the interpretation of $\delta^{18}$O values. In recent years, proxy system models (PSMs) have emerged to quantitatively assess the confounding effects of these processes. This study presents the first integrated stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O PSM (Karstolution) by coupling an existing karst hydrology with an in-cave fractionation PSM. The new modelling framework not only couples the two models, but also includes diffuse flow modelling, coupling of drip rate with infiltration, linking of surface with cave temperature, and incorporates cave seasonality effects. We test Karstolution using a cave monitoring dataset from Golgotha Cave, SW Australia. The predictive capacity of the model is assessed by comparing the output to stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O values. By comparing with observed stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O values, this study is also the first to quantify in-cave disequilibrium both kinetic isotopic fractionation in a speleothem and informs the conclusion that hydroclimatic processes contributes more to the variability of stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O values at Golgotha Cave than does in-cave processes. This is further supported via a sensitivity analysis performed by simulating the impacts of a wider range of cave temperature, ventilation, drip interval and $p$CO$_2$ values than measured.
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1 Introduction

Speleothems provide valuable paleoclimatic information due to their long time spans ($10^2$ - $10^4$ years), precise chronology, high resolution (sub-decadal to sub-annual depending on growth rate), and relatively widespread distribution [McDermott, 2004]. The interpretation of speleothem δ¹⁸O values is still difficult due to the non-linearity of karst hydrology and in-cave isotopic fractionation (see [Hartmann and Baker, 2017]).

Despite the common assumption that rainfall and cave dripwater δ¹⁸O values have a linear relationship, cave monitoring has revealed potential non-linear processes associated with variable infiltration of recharge, mixing of various water stores, and non-linear water movement (e.g. [Ayalon et al., 1998; Baker and Brunsdon, 2003; Fairchild et al., 2006; Mischel et al., 2015]). This can be further influenced by: accentuation of high magnitude precipitation [Pape et al., 2010], mixing of different types of flow (e.g. fracture and diffuse flow), and soil and epikarst evaporation [Cuthbert et al., 2014a].

Deposition of speleothem calcite under conditions of isotopic equilibrium implies isotopic equilibrium between CaCO₃, HCO₃⁻ and H₂O, such that the precipitated calcite is in isotopic equilibrium with the water [Hendy, 1971]. However, many in-cave processes may prevent equilibrium isotopic fractionation: (i) low relative humidity and in-cave air movement allow evaporative fractionation of dripwater δ¹⁸O values [Deininger et al., 2012]; (ii) high supersaturation of the dripwater with respect to calcite (related to both cave and soil pCO₂) results in rapid precipitation after degassing of CO₂, which may disturb the isotope equilibrium between CaCO₃, HCO₃⁻ and H₂O [Deininger et al., 2012; Mickler et al., 2006; Scholz et al., 2009]; (iii) the time between two subsequent drips may affect the degree of isotope disequilibrium [Deininger et al., 2012; Frisia et al., 2011; Kaufmann, 2003; Mühlinghaus et al., 2007; Mühlinghaus et al., 2009; Riechlmann et al., 2013].

To advance our capacity to interpret the climatic record in speleothems, study sites are carefully chosen, and monitoring of cave conditions, dripwater, and hydrology are established (e.g. [Baker et al., 2014; Baldini et al., 2012; Duan et al., 2016; Frisia et al., 2011; Markowska et al., 2015; Spötter et al., 2005]). However, quantification of the aforementioned processes is difficult, with issues outlined with respect to the ‘Hendy Test’ [Dorale and Liu, 2009] and linear regression climate calibrations [Baker and Bradley, 2010]. Replication from multiple stalagmites [Stoll et al., 2015], clumped isotope thermometry (∆47; Affek et al., 2008) and analysis of fluid inclusions [Kluge et al., 2008] have been proposed to demonstrate oxygen isotope equilibrium between water and speleothem calcite, but these may be difficult to apply in practice.

To provide insights on the primary drivers of speleothem δ¹⁸O variability, Proxy System Models (PSMs) have emerged, using climatic inputs and numerical representation of the processes for forward modelling of the proxies [Evans et al., 2013]. These models allow quantification of sensitivity to various processes affecting proxy interpretation [Wong and Breecker, 2015]. The quantitative approach of PSMs also facilitates simulations of ‘what-if’ climate scenarios to be compared against proxy data (e.g. [Baker et al., 2012]), as well as assisting with constraining climate models, especially in the emergent field of paleoclimate data assimilation (e.g. [Dee et al., 2016]).

Hence, a number of karst and speleothem PSMs have been developed (Table 1). However, the majority of the stalagmite δ¹⁸O PSMs focus either on karst processes or in-cave processes and adopt a simplified representation of the other part of the system. Of these, KarstFor [Bradley et al., 2010] and ISOLUTION [Deininger et al., 2012], represent the most advanced treatment of the processes affecting δ¹⁸O values in the karst and cave, respectively.

Using a lumped parameter approach to model the complexities of karst hydrogeology, KarstFor was first presented in Bradley et al. (2010) and subsequently enhanced with multiple adaptations (e.g. [Baker and Bradley, 2010; Baker et al., 2013; Treble et al., 2013]). The initial iterations of KarstFor consisted of climatic inputs (Table 2) and a monthly time-step for reservoirs representing the soil, epikarst and vadose zone. This accounted for evaporative oxygen isotope fractionation in the soil store and represented water-balance, mixing, overflow and underflow movement. The approach was highly parameterised, thus requiring constraints by site-specific knowledge, and assumed in-cave equilibrium isotope fractionation (using the [Kim and O’Neil, 1997] fractionation factor between water and calcite).
**Table 1: Summary of existing stalagmite and karst based forward models (PSMs) excluding catchment scale karst models.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Published</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In-Cave Processes (No Karst Processes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of stalagmite growth and $\delta^{13}$C values on the stalagmite surface solution.</td>
<td>[Romanov et al., 2008a; b]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISOLUTION</td>
<td>Model of in-cave evaporation and isotope fractionation processes affecting stalagmite growth, $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta^{18}$O values.</td>
<td>[Deininger et al., 2012; Mühlinghaus et al., 2009; Scholz et al., 2009]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalagmite growth model based on in-cave conditions (drip saturation, $pCO_2$ and cave temperature) and climatic inputs.</td>
<td>[Kaufmann, 2003; Mühlinghaus et al., 2007; Baker et al., 2014]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-STAL</td>
<td>Model of dripwater Mg, Sr and Ba from drip rate and drip saturation with respect to calcite; also represents prior calcite precipitation and dripwater chemistry.</td>
<td>[Stoll et al., 2012]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model of the temporal isotopic ($\delta^{18}$O and $\delta^{13}$C) evolution of DIC in a thin film precipitating calcite.</td>
<td>[Dreybrodt and Romanov, 2016]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soil and In-Cave Processes (No Karst Processes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODSM</td>
<td>Model of stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O values from climatic input, soil mixing and vegetation effects. Soil water was modelled straight to in-cave and temperature dependent fractionation applied.</td>
<td>[Wackerbarth, 2012; Wackerbarth et al., 2010; Wackerbarth et al., 2012]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model of $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta^{18}$O values in soil (against soil $pCO_2$) and in-cave isotope fractionation processes.</td>
<td>[Dreybrodt and Scholz, 2011]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaveCalc</td>
<td>PHREEQC-based model of soil, bedrock and in-cave processes including isotopes and trace elements.</td>
<td>Owen et al. (2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Karst Processes (No In-Cave Processes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Climatically fed single reservoir model with fracture flow for high magnitude rainfall and diffuse flow for low magnitude rainfall.</td>
<td>[Baker et al., 2010; Nagra et al., 2016]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two layer reservoir dripwater $\delta^{18}$O model based on climatic input, with stores modelled as steady state.</td>
<td>[Truebe et al., 2010]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KarstFor</td>
<td>Three (or four) layer reservoir model with soil evaporation, monthly water balance, overflow and underflow based on climatic input. Dripwater $\delta^{18}$O values include temperature dependant isotope fractionation.</td>
<td>[Baker and Bradley, 2010; Baker et al., 2013; Baker et al., 2010; Fairchild and Baker, 2012; Jex et al., 2013; Treble et al., 2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two reservoir dripwater $\delta^{18}$O model based on climatic input and defined residence time.</td>
<td>[Moerman et al., 2014]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two layer reservoir model with daily water balance, mixing of $\delta^{18}$O values and epikarst evaporation to model dripwater $\delta^{18}$O values.</td>
<td>[Cuthbert et al., 2014]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two reservoir discharge model with daily water balance.</td>
<td>Campbell et al., 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARSTMOD</td>
<td>Variable reservoir model of discharge at karst springs based on climatic input.</td>
<td>[Jourde et al., 2015]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRYSM</td>
<td>Open source GCM enabled single reservoir model using a mean transit time, $\tau$. PRYSM includes models for other climate sensors (e.g. ice cores) and incorporates the errors associated with age assignments.</td>
<td>[Dee et al., 2015]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISOLUTION [Deininger et al., 2012] simulates speleothem $\delta^{18}O$ values in dependence of cave temperature, drip interval, cave air $pCO_2$, dripwater $pCO_2$ (an equivalent for the dripwater $Ca^{2+}$ concentration), relative humidity and cave ventilation during speleothem growth. ISOLUTION is based on previous models describing speleothem growth and stable isotope fractionation (see [Deininger et al., 2012] and [Deininger and Scholz, 2019] for details). By including in-cave oxygen isotope disequilibrium and evaporative fractionation effects [Deininger et al., 2012], ISOLUTION is currently the most advanced model describing speleothem oxygen isotope fractionation effects.

Here we present the first stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ PSM combining karst and in-cave processes (Karstolution). This integrated surface-to-stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ PSM is a coupling of the KarstFor and ISOLUTION models and allows for the first time the quantification of the effects of both karst and in-cave processes. Karstolution includes the addition of diffuse flow, growth rate, modelling of in-cave seasonality and the coupling of drip infiltration and cave temperature. We present a case study of Golgotha Cave using monitoring data first presented by Treble et al. (2013) as well as data from recently deposited calcite. Based on these data, we show how the Karstolution parameters can be localised to a particular cave site and demonstrate how the model can be used to evaluate the relative effects of climatic, karst and in-cave processes. As the conceptual model of Karstolution is generic it is not limited to Golgotha Cave and can be applied to any karst setting.

2 Karstolution overview

Karstolution is a generic model that may be applied to many different karst settings, it couples KarstFor and ISOLUTION and is the first integrated surface to stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ PSM. The model is coded in Python, with all code available on GitHub (https://github.com/swase/karstolution). Karstolution is based on a phenomenological representation of a karst system (Fig 1; Table 2) that is not derived from fundamental laws. This has the advantage of limiting the model complexity, thus making it relatively simple to reason with, fast to execute, and easier to configure. Disadvantages include: model parameters that are not simple to relate to physical properties of the system, and limited ability to precisely reproduce the observed time series. The model is mainly suited to hypothesis testing. For example, isolating the impact of individual forcings, or varying these forcings through time. Model calibration can be treated as an iterative process, beginning with a single active flow path, followed by step-by-step introduction of more complexity.

The karst component of the model follows the KarstFor version presented in Baker et al. [2013], with water levels in reservoirs (Soil Store, Epikarst, KS1 and KS2) given an initial value (mm) and then recalculated (starting from the top store) at a monthly time step, via:

$$\Delta V = (\Sigma In - \Sigma Out) \Delta t$$

where $\Delta V$ = net change in store volume (mm) per month, $In$ = input flows and $Out$ = output flows (mm/month) [either: fracture flow, diffuse flow or rainfall (Fig. 1)], and $\Delta t = 1$ month.

The $\delta^{18}O$ values in each store are updated with the time step based on the water balance calculations. Three stalagmite outputs, representing multiple karst configurations, are modelled as per Baker et al. [2013]. At each stalagmite output, the ISOLUTION model is applied to account for potential in-cave fractionation processes, using the $\delta^{18}O$ value of the input reservoir water and the cave parameters outlined in Table 2, to simulate stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ values. For further description of the ISOLUTION model, we refer the reader to Deininger et al. [2012] and Deininger and Scholz (2019). Additional modelling capabilities: 1. in-cave seasonality, 2. diffuse flow, 3. the coupling of drip rate between the KarstFor and ISOLUTION models, as well as 4. stalagmite growth rate) have been added and are described below.

2.1 In-cave seasonality

The factors that may affect in-cave fractionation of $\delta^{18}O$ values can vary seasonally or at even higher frequency [Baker et al., 2014; Markowska et al., 2015; Spötl et al., 2005; Treble et al., 2015]. For example, seasonal cave ventilation can control cave air $pCO_2$, an important factor affecting dripwater supersaturation and, as a consequence, disequilibrium oxygen isotope fractionation, as well as leading to seasonal biases in speleothem growth and geochemistry [Baldini et al., 2008; James et al., 2015; Spötl et al., 2005]. As continuous cave parameter time series are rarely measured, it is not practical to
require this as an input series. Therefore, Karstolution allows the user to define seasonality of all factors that potentially affect in-cave oxygen isotope fractionation at their site through monthly averages of the cave parameters for each month of the year. The model additions in the next sections preserve this user-defined seasonality in its calculations.

![Conceptual figure of the Karstolution model. The boxes represent reservoirs, blue lines represent water levels, grey arrows represent fracture flow, and the red arrow represents diffuse flow.](image)

**Figure 1.** Conceptual figure of the Karstolution model. The boxes represent reservoirs, blue lines represent water levels, grey arrows represent fracture flow, and the red arrow represents diffuse flow. While a brief overview of the overall model is given in the main text, the details of the KarstFor and ISOLUTION models are given in Baker et al. [2013] and Deininger et al. [2012], respectively. Details of the coupling of the two models, modifications and additions are outlined in the main text. Each stalagmite output takes into account the effect of various cave parameters as described by ISOLUTION. See Table 2 for a summary of model inputs and parameters.

### 2.2 Dripwater coupling

The residence time of the surface water layer on the stalagmite controls the degree of the resulting isotopic disequilibrium [Deininger et al., 2012; Scholz et al., 2009]. As this residence time is dictated by the drip interval, which in turn is dependent on karst hydrology, modelling of the drip interval from the karst is necessary for application of ISOLUTION. We model drip-infiltration as gravity fed, with a linear response to the volume present in the karst store. Users specify the drip rate when the store is empty, \( q_0 \), and full, \( q_1 \), and the model calculates the instantaneous drip rate, \( q \), according to

\[
q = (q_1 - q_0) \frac{k_{\text{size}}}{k_{\text{stor}}} + q_0
\]

where \( k_{\text{size}} \) is the capacity of the karst store directly supplying the drip (mm) and \( k_{\text{stor}} \) is the current level of the karst store (mm; blue line in the stores shown in Fig. 1). The modelled drip interval, \( DI \), is then

\[
DI = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{q} & q > 0 \\
9001 & q \leq 0 
\end{cases}
\]

This allows for a choice of \( q_0 \) and \( q_1 \) where dripping stops before the store empties completely and represents the “no drip” state with a placeholder value.
2.3 Temperature coupling

Cave temperature is a key parameter for modelling stable isotope fractionation as well as the kinetics of calcite precipitation. Previously, the KarstFor model approximated cave air temperature as surface air temperature. However, this may not be the case due to the time taken for a surface heat signal to diffuse through bedrock [Domínguez-Villar et al., 2013]. Disequilibrium between surface and cave temperature may be affected by factors such as land use change, shading, fire, and rapid climate change [Domínguez-Villar et al., 2015; Nagra et al., 2016]. To deal with this, surface-cave temperature coupling is implemented in Karstolution with a site-specific difference between the ground surface and cave air temperature ($\Delta T_{S-C}$). While maintaining $\Delta T_{S-C}$, cave temperature varies using a user-defined moving average of the surface temperature (36-months in this study). A useful guide for temperature-depth penetration at different time periods is, for instance, presented in Fig. 9 of Rau et al. [2015].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Final configuration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil store (mm)</td>
<td>Set to a small configuration with no soil evaporative fractionation as per field observations</td>
<td>Init: 150 Max: 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epikarst (mm)</td>
<td>Set to a small configuration with no epikarst evaporative fractionation as per field observations</td>
<td>Init: 30 Max: 50 Epicap: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS1 (mm)</td>
<td>Primary karst store that receives flux from epikarst via $k_{\text{diffuse}}$ and/or F3; may also receive overflow from KS2.</td>
<td>Init: 200 Max: 870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS2 (mm)</td>
<td>Secondary karst store that fills via F4 and drains via F6 or permits modelling of switchable overflow to KS1 via F7. Magnitude of overflow is proportional to KS2/KS1 ratio.</td>
<td>Init: 1000 Max: 1400 Ovicap: 1150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 (mm/month)</td>
<td>Determines steady state values in soil store.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (mm/month)</td>
<td>Flux representing fracture flow from Epikarst to KS1. Set to zero according to field observations of flow dominated by diffuse flow.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4 (mm/month)</td>
<td>Flux from Epikarst to KS2 activated when threshold ‘Epicap’ is reached.</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5 (mm/month)</td>
<td>Drainage flux of KS1.</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7 (mm/month)</td>
<td>Overflow from KS2 back into KS1 once ‘ovicap’ is exceeded.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6 (mm/month)</td>
<td>Drainage flux of KS2.</td>
<td>0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8 (mm/month)</td>
<td>Bypass flow from the surface to KS2. Used to test configuration used by Treble et al. (2013) that KS2 was preferentially being recharged by rainfall events $&gt;7$mm/month, but set to zero in final configuration.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{diffuse}}$ (mm/month)</td>
<td>Flux is via pdf function to simulate diffuse flow.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi$</td>
<td>Mixing parameter of dripwater with the water layer on the stalagmite surface</td>
<td>1 (based on observations of limited drip splashing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{e evap}}$</td>
<td>Fraction of water remaining in epikarst available to evaporate</td>
<td>0.1 (i.e. 10% per month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{d18O soil}}$</td>
<td>Isotopic evaporation coefficient for soil store</td>
<td>$‰$ month$^{-1}$ mm$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{d18O epi}}$</td>
<td>Isotopic evaporation coefficient for epikarst store</td>
<td>$‰$ month$^{-1}$ mm$^{-1}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4 Diffuse flow

Diffuse flow is an important addition to the previous fracture-flow-only versions of KarstFor [Baker and Bradley, 2010], which would have poorly simulated sites with significant diffuse flow. Here, diffuse flow includes flow through smaller fractures as well as the matrix and mathematically, no mixing occurs along streamlines. Conversely, fracture flow is modelled as flow into reservoirs which are immediately mixed. Following from the approach of Treble et al. (2013), Karstolution uses a Weibull distribution to model diffuse flow. This was chosen because the Weibull distribution is a generalisation of the Exponential and Rayleigh distributions, and has a variable shape and skewness and hence can represent a large variety of possible transit time distributions [Almalki and Nadarajah, 2014]. The need to model variable flow distributions has been demonstrated for a novel D$_2$O irrigation experiment at Wellington Caves (semi-arid, SE Australia), where cave dripwaters were shown to be a mix of tracer, modern and paleo-water (see Fig. 4 of [Markowska et al., 2016]).

The two parameter Weibull distribution is represented as

$$f(x; \lambda, k) = \frac{k}{\lambda} \left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right)^{k-1} e^{-\left(\frac{x}{\lambda}\right)^k}$$

where $x \geq 0, k > 0, \lambda > 0$.

The two parameters, $k$ and $\lambda$, represent shape and scale, respectively (Fig. 2). The Weibull function is implemented over the domain $0 \leq x \leq 2$, divided over an adjustable-length mixing window. At each model step, $k$ diffuse determines the diffuse flow leaving the epikarst (see Table 2). This, along with the values for the previous months, is multiplied by the corresponding weights ($y$-values from Fig. 2) from the Weibull. The resulting flow entering KS1 (red arrow, Fig. 1) represents the diffuse flow amount for that month. Here, this process is applied to both water fluxes and mixing of $\delta^{18}$O values, rather than just $\delta^{18}$O, as in Treble et al. (2013). It is implemented in the same manner every iteration (i.e. there are no seasonal factors included in the diffuse flow).

As shown in Fig. 2, the Weibull parameters, $k$ and $\lambda$, control the residence time distribution. The scale parameter, $k$, controls where the peak occurs whereas the shape parameter, $\lambda$, can be used to change the distribution from left-skewed to right-skewed. As well as introducing a lag into the system, the diffuse flow parameterisation dampens the seasonal cycle. It does this more as the width of the peak increases, as shown in Fig. 2.

Figure 2. (a) Weibull distribution with parameters adjusted to change the peak width and shape. (b) the effect of changing the diffuse flow parameterisation on the amplitude, $A$, of a sinusoidal $\delta^{18}$O input series. The input $\delta^{18}$O series has a period of 12 months, amplitude of $A_0$, monthly precipitation is held fixed, and other model parameters are set to the configuration given in Table 2.
2.5 Growth rate

The seasonal variation in speleothem growth rate can be important when comparing field observations to model output because the mean observed $\delta^{18}$O will be weighted towards periods of faster growth. Speleothem growth rates are computed by Karstolution using the method presented by Kaufmann (2008), based on Dreybrodt (1999), whereby the growth rate, $W_0$, is

$$W_0 = 1.17 \times 10^2 (c - c_{app}) \delta \exp \left(-\frac{\alpha}{\delta} \Delta d\right)$$

where $c$ is the $pCO_2$ of water droplets, $c_{app}$ is the apparent equilibrium $pCO_2$ of cave air ($1/\sqrt{0.8}$ times the cave air $pCO_2$), $\delta$ is the water film thickness (set to 0.01 cm), $\Delta d$ is the drop interval, $\alpha$ is a rate constant, and the numerical factor is chosen so that $W_0$ has units of m year$^{-1}$. As with the calculation of $\delta^{18}$O, there is an optional correction for drop splashing (detailed by Deininger et al., 2012).

3 Site description

Golgotha Cave, SW Western Australia (34°05’S, 115°03’E, Fig. 3), is located in a highly porous Quaternary-age calcarenite of aeolian origin. The present-day climate is Mediterranean-type. The cave is located at approximately 40 m depth under a wet eucalypt, evergreen forest (mixed E. diversicolor and E. calophylla). Drip monitoring studies at Golgotha Cave have shown consistent drip-rates despite the distinctly seasonal rainfall [Treble et al., 2013]. LiDAR analysis coupled with high temporal and spatial-resolution drip-logger studies confirmed the dominance of diffuse flow, temporally consistent drip-rates and storage [Mahmud et al., 2015; 2016; 2018]. For further details about Golgotha Cave studies refer to Treble et al. [2013], Treble et al. [2016], Mahmud et al. [2015] and Mahmud et al. [2016].

4 Methods

4.1 Cave monitoring data

This study utilises data from August 2005 until March 2012 from Golgotha Cave that were previously published in Treble et al. (2013). Procedures for rainwater and dripwater sampling and analytical methods are presented in Treble et al. [2013; 2015].
The average cave parameters for each month of the year were determined by calculating the monthly means of the following data originally acquired at 15 min intervals using a Datataker DT80 logger between May 2017 and April 2018:

- relative humidity with a Vaisala HMP155 with Humicap 180RC and sensor warming enabled to negate saturation of the sensor at high humidity (accuracy ± 1.8%);
- cave temperature with a Vaisala independent temperature probe (accuracy ± 0.13°C);
- cave ventilation with a Gill Windsonic (±2%); and
- cave air $p$CO$_2$ with a Viasala GM252 with measurement range 0-10,000 ppm (accuracy ± 100 ppm). The longer cave air $p$CO$_2$ dataset (March 2009 – June 2014) presented in Treble et al. (2015) was used to match the time period of drip $p$CO$_2$ data (Treble et al., 2015).

4.2 Modern stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O values

To further validate the model, modern stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O data from the drip sites were compared with the model output. The method of sampling the modern calcite $\delta^{18}$O is described in Treble et al. [2005]. Average stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O values of approximately 10 years of growth preceding stalagmite sampling, and the range of values at each site and analytical error (0.07‰, 2σ) was applied to quantify the uncertainties.

5 Results

5.1.1 In-cave processes

The monthly means from cave monitoring data used in the model are presented in Figs. 4a-c. Cave temperature displays a smooth seasonal cycle, peaking in February-April but with low overall variability (14.5-14.8°C; Fig. 4a). Other cave variables display similar seasonal maxima, also occurring in late summer/early autumn. Relative humidity is high (98-100%; Fig. 4a). Cave-air and dripwater $p$CO$_2$ (Fig. 4b-c) demonstrate strong seasonality, reaching summer peaks of 2600 and 6800 ppmV and winter minimums of 540 and 1000 ppmV, respectively. This and the subtler seasonal trend in relative humidity are driven by temperature-driven gradients in seasonal cave ventilation (Treble et al., 2015) although air speed measurements demonstrate that air movement in the cave is low (≤ 0.03 m s$^{-1}$; Fig. 4b).

5.1.2 Stalagmite calcite $\delta^{18}$O values

Stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O values are compared to the simulated Karstolution output as well as the output resulting from applying the equilibrium stable isotope fractionation factor of Kim and O'Neil [1997] (Fig. 5). Since Karstolution accounts for in-cave evaporative and disequilibrium isotope fractionation effects in addition to the equilibrium fractionation effect generated by the Kim and O'Neil [1997] equation, comparing the two outputs enables us to quantify the impact of in-cave disequilibrium fractionation. In general there is good agreement between the observed stalagmite $\delta^{18}$O mean values and modelled outputs for Site 1A (Fig. 5) indicating that this stalagmite is precipitating at near isotopic equilibrium. The seasonal maxima of the Karstolution outputs overlap with the observed stalagmite means. This is consistent with the expectation that stalagmite deposition in Golgotha Cave will be biased towards the cooler months (Treble et al., 2015) and indicates that non-equilibrium processes may be more enhanced when the cave is in ventilated mode.
A sensitivity analysis was performed to determine which cave parameters potentially drive stalagmite δ¹⁸O variability at Golgotha Cave. Figure 6 shows a reference case based on Site 1A, along with perturbations to cave parameters (Fig. 4). It demonstrated that the isotopic impact of temperature should be considered once mean cave temperature variability exceeds ±2°C (i.e., greater than that expected for the Holocene).

In terms of the potential isotopic impact of disequilibrium processes, stalagmite δ¹⁸O appears to have some sensitivity to drip interval over the observed range for Golgotha Cave (Fig. 6b). The degree of disequilibrium increases at longer drip intervals as indicated by the departure from the predicted equilibrium δ¹⁸O values. This is consistent with the expectation that deviation from isotopic equilibrium increases with the degree of calcite precipitation (Mühlinghaus et al., 2009; Deininger et al., 2012) before another drip falls. The sensitivity to changes in relative humidity and cave air movement are negligible due to the low variability of these parameters at Golgotha Cave (Fig. 6). The latter is in agreement with findings of negligible disequilibrium isotopic fractionation effects provided cave ventilation is less than 0.2 m/s and relative humidity greater than 85% [Deininger et al., 2012; Dreybrodt and Deininger, 2014], and indicates that in-cave evaporative fractionation is not a driver of stalagmite δ¹⁸O variability in this karst setting. Finally, the sensitivity of stalagmite δ¹⁸O at Site 1A to
the gradient between dripwater and cave $pCO_2$ is small to negligible (Fig. 6d), although this effect may become more important if the drip interval at this site were to increase (Fig. 6b).

Figure 6. Sensitivity analysis for cave parameters at drip Site 1A: (a) cave temperature. (b) drip interval. (c) relative humidity and cave ventilation. (d) cave air minus dripwater $pCO_2$. In order to preserve the measured seasonality in cave parameters, the reference case uses monthly values from Fig. 4 and perturbations have a constant offset across all months, with the addition of a limit to physically-realistic values (e.g. humidity must lie in the range 0-1). The predicted equilibrium calcite $\delta^{18}O$ from Figure 5 is also reproduced on Figure 6b for comparison.

6 Discussion

The cave-parameter sensitivity analysis (Fig. 6) demonstrated sensitivity of Golgotha Cave stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ to cave temperature and drip interval and minimal isotopic effects of changes in evaporation and the cave air and dripwater $pCO_2$ gradient. Modelling the effects of in-cave disequilibrium isotope and evaporative fractionation over that of equilibrium isotope fractionation (Fig. 5) shows that at Golgotha Cave disequilibrium effects contribute negligibly to stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ variability (Fig. 5). It is emphasised here that disequilibrium is accounted for in Karstolution, whereas kinetic fractionation is not. Disequilibrium isotope fractionation modelled by Karstolution accounts for the disturbance of the isotope equilibrium between CaCO$_3$, HCO$_3^-$ and H$_2$O. In contrast, kinetic isotope fractionation represents the change of the isotope fractionation factor in relation to e.g., the precipitation rate (see Dietzl et al. 2009). Thus kinetic fractionation could be viewed as the offset between the Karstolution modelled values and the observed speleothem $\delta^{18}O$, implying that kinetic fractionation effects also have small to negligible isotopic impact on Golgotha Cave stalagmites. Adopting other fractionation factors (e.g. Coplen, 2007) may result in larger offsets compared to the predicted equilibrium output and may be appropriate for other locations.

One of the major advantages of Karstolution compared to previous stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ PSMs is the isolation of various factors affecting isotopic values. For example, in analysing a Scottish millennial-length stalagmite with KarstFor, Baker et al. [2012] noted there was uncertainty if in-cave fractionation effects occur. In addition, integration of temperature-dependence of precipitation kinetics during calcite deposition, allows better representation and analysis of the effects of temperature and climate variability on stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ values. This enables novel studies about both karst and cave effects, such as simulations of glacial-interglacial transitions, investigation of evaporative cooling [Cuthbert et al., 2014b; Rau et al., 2015] and the simulation of fire impacts, which increase soil evaporation and decrease the calcium content of the dripwater [Nagra et al., 2016]. The ability to competently model
The processes is critical in stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ PSMs, augmenting the ability of these records to provide accurate quantifications of uncertainty in climate models.

7 Conclusions

This study represents the first integrated stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ PSM: representing both karst hydrological and in-cave isotope fractionation processes. The primary assumptions incorporated into Karstolution have been conditionally confirmed based on its ability to generally simulate measured drip rate response and measured stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ values, at Golgotha Cave, it is concluded that stalagmite $\delta^{18}O$ variability in the model is primarily driven by climatic inputs and the karst system rather than in-cave processes.

Future research will include model confirmation of Karstolution at other sites of different climates and hydrogeologies world-wide. Further modelling of the impacts of fire are also warranted. Future combination of Karstolution with GCMs and large climate models could also allow analysis of long-term model performance and facilitate realistic estimates of the variability of $\delta^{18}O$ values from the surface to the stalagmite.
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