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Abstract

Despite widespread use of branched glycerol dialkyl glycerol tetraethers (brGDGTs) for paleo-temperature reconstruction, no global calibration for their application in lakes has been generated since improved analytical methods have allowed for the separation of the structural isomers. This is a substantial obstacle for the application of this tool as soil calibrations underestimate temperature values when applied to lake sediments. Here, we present a comprehensive dataset ($N = 261$) of lacustrine brGDGT distributions spanning a wide range of geographical locations, environmental temperatures, and lakewater pH values. Empirical Orthogonal Function (EOF) analysis on the fractional abundance of brGDGTs indicates that temperature exerts a strong control (explaining 86\% of the variance) on the lipid distribution. However, the influence of water chemistry is less clear, as pH and conductivity have a weak influence on brGDGT distributions. We use our dataset to generate a new Bayesian temperature calibration, which has an $R^2 = 0.85$ and RMSE = 2.8°C. Application of this new calibration to a previously published lake core record demonstrates that it generates values comparable with instrumental observations. Our new calibration facilitates the use of lacustrine brGDGTs to reconstruct continental tempera-
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Branched glycerol dialkyl glycerol tetraethers (brGDGTs) are a family of membrane-spanning lipids consisting of two alkyl chains ether-bonded to glycerol molecules on both ends. Each of the 15 different structures varies in the number (4 – 6) and position (5’ or 6’) of methyl groups as well as number of cyclopentane moieties (0 – 2) (De Jonge et al., 2013; Weijers et al., 2006). Their structure with alkyl chains and, most importantly, the stereochemistry of the glycerol group strongly point to a bacterial source (Weijers et al., 2006) for these molecules. Based on their abundance in peatlands, where brGDGTs were first described (Sinninghe Damsté et al., 2000), and the fact that this phylum is very diverse and poorly understood, Acidobacteria has been suggested as a brGDGT producer (Weijers et al., 2009). Later work showed the presence of small amounts of brGDGT Ia in two bacteria from the subgroup 1 of the Acidobacteria phylum (Sinninghe Damsté et al., 2018, 2011). Nevertheless, to this day only the building blocks for brGDGTs have been found in other members of the phylum, and none of the other brGDGTs have been found in any organism. More recent work has suggested that the production of brGDGTs could be linked to changes in microbial community, rather than specific organisms adapting their membranes (De Jonge et al., 2019; Weber et al., 2018).

While early literature described brGDGTs as biomarkers associated with peats and soils (Weijers et al., 2007; Sinninghe Damsté et al., 2000), later analyses have shown that these lipids can also be produced in aquatic environments such as lakes (Russell et al., 2018; Weber et al., 2015; Tierney et al., 2010; Tierney & Russell, 2009), rivers (De Jonge et al., 2014b; Zell et al., 2013), and coastal areas (Xiao et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2014; Peterse et al., 2009). Discovery of a lacustrine-specific 5/6 methyl isomer provides further evidence of in situ production of brGDGTs in lakes (Weber et al., 2015), and also raises the
possibility that the organisms involved in the production of these molecules in lakes vs. soils might be different.

The relative abundance of brGDGTs has been shown to change in response to both pH and temperature (Martinez-Sosa et al., 2020; Dang et al., 2018; De Jonge et al., 2014b; Tierney et al., 2010; Weijers et al., 2007). Weijers et al. (2007) proposed the use of two indices—the cyclisation index of branched tetraethers (CBT) and methylation index of branched tetraethers (MBT)—to reflect this response. Later analytical advances using High Performance Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry (HPLC-MS) (Hopmans et al., 2016; De Jonge et al., 2014a) improved these indices by separating the 5’ and 6’ isomers. MBT$_{5Me}$, a new version of MBT, was generated excluding the 6’ isomers, and CBT was updated to CBT’ by including both 5’ and 6’ isomers (De Jonge et al., 2014a).

Other environmental factors may also impact brGDGT distribution, such as soil moisture (Dang et al., 2016b), redox state (Weber et al., 2018), and oxygen (Martinez-Sosa & Tierney, 2019; Huguet et al., 2017; Tierney et al., 2012). Since the identity of the source organisms remains unknown (Sinninghe Damsté et al., 2018), it is unclear how much impact these parameters have on the brGDGT response, or if their influence is environment-dependent, with different effects in soils and lakes.

A combination of their ubiquity, their response to changes in the environment, and their potential for preservation (Kemp et al., 2014) make brGDGTs a valuable tool for paleoclimate reconstructions. In the absence of pure culture studies, empirical calibrations are used to infer temperature and pH from brGDGT distributions. Global calibrations using the Hopmans et al. (2016) method exist for soils and peats (Dearing Crampton-Flood et al., 2020; Naafs et al., 2017a,b). However, since soil calibrations underestimate temperature when applied to lake sediments (Pearson et al., 2011; Tierney et al., 2010; Tierney & Russell, 2009; Russell et al., 2018), these cannot be used for lacustrine applications. While several local (Loomis et al., 2012; Sun et al., 2011; Tierney et al., 2010) and global (Pearson et al., 2011) lake calibrations have been pre-
sent, most of them were performed with the old analytical method and thus
did not fully separate the 5’ and 6’ isomers. Thus far, only local calibrations
have been generated with the improved method (Russell et al., 2018; Dang et al.,
2018, 2016a).

This work presents a dataset of 261 lake sediment samples from a wide
range of locations and environmental regimes. We analyze the distribution
of brGDGTs and compare their relationship with environmental parameters to
better understand this proxy system. We then use our dataset to construct a new
global temperature calibration for lakes. Finally, we apply our new calibration
to a previously published late Holocene lake core record in order to demonstrate
its applicability.

2. Methods

2.1. Samples

We analyzed 158 new core top (cc. top 10 cm) samples, spanning a wide
range of Mean Annual Air Temperatures, precipitation regimes and pH (Fig.
and Supplementary Table A.1). Samples were processed in either the Uni-
versity of Arizona (UA) or the University of Wyoming (UW) (Supplementary
Table A.1). All samples were freeze-dried for 48 h, ground and homogenized in
a solvent-cleaned mortar, and then extracted with an Accelerated Solvent Ex-
traction (ASE) system (run at 1500 psi, 100°C, with dichloromethane:methanol
(9:1)). At UW, the resulting total lipid extracts (TLEs) were first separated
over an aminopropyl (LC-NH$_2$) solid phase column using first DCM:Isopropanol
(2:1), and then 4% acetic acid in DCM. GDGTs were recovered from the former
fractions and subsequently separated over an activated silica gel column using
Hexane, DCM, and MeOH, from which GDGT were further isolated. At UA,
the TLEs were eluted through a deactivated SiO$_2$ column with hexane:ethyl
acetate (1:2), and dried our samples under a $N_2$ stream. Both UA and UW
samples were redissolved in hexane:isopropanol (99:1), and then passed through
a 0.45 $\mu$m PTFE filter prior to being analyzed by HPLC. GDGTs were analyzed
on an Agilent 1260 Infinity HPLC coupled to an Agilent 6120 single quadrupole mass spectrometer using two BEH HILIC silica columns (2.1 × 150 mm, 1.7 μm; Waters) and the methodology of Hopmans et al. (2016). We calculated peak areas using the MATLAB package software ORIGAmI (Fleming & Tierney, 2016) and quantified brGDGTs by comparing the obtained peaks with a C₄₆ internal standard (Huguet et al., 2006) normalized to the mass of each sample. However, our statistical analyses are based on the fractional abundances of the brGDGTs, and not the absolute abundance (Supplementary Table A.2).

We supplemented our dataset with published values, including 65 samples from African lakes (Russell et al., 2018), and 38 Chinese lakes (Dang et al., 2016a, 2018). Collectively this work includes data from a total of 261 lakes. We further compare our results with 663 soil and peat samples from the Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020) calibration. It should be noted that some variability may be introduced in the dataset due to data deriving from different laboratories.

2.2. Temperature and Precipitation Data

Mean Annual Air Temperature (MAAT) and precipitation (MAP) for Dang et al. (2016a, 2018), and our sites were derived from either the PRISM product at a 800 m resolution, for samples within the continental USA and Alaska (PRISM Climate Group, Oregon State University), or from the CRU TS 4.01 product at a resolution of 0.5° for the rest of the samples (Osborn & Jones, 2014). Values were obtained following the approach used by Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020), where chordal distances were calculated for each sample. Multiple samples within the same lake were averaged and treated as one data point, except for samples from Lake Malawi due to its large size, in which case they were kept distinct. For the Russell et al. (2018) and Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020) sites we used the parameters reported by the authors. Following Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020) we also calculated the mean temperature of months above freezing (MAF). In the case of samples from Russell et al. (2018) we considered MAF to be equal to MAAT, as lakes in this region experience larger daily oscillations in temperature than seasonal,
with freezing occurring only at night [Eggermont et al., 2007].

2.3. pH and Conductivity Data

Water pH was measured on site for the UW samples (Supplementary Table A.1). For the remaining samples we collected pH and conductivity data from the literature when available (Supplementary Table A.1). For the rest of the dataset we used values reported by the authors in the original work [Dearing Crampton-Flood et al., 2020; Russell et al., 2018; Sinninghe Damsté et al., 2018; Dang et al., 2016a].

2.4. Empirical Orthogonal Function Analysis

Empirical Orthogonal Function (EOF) analysis (Lorenz, 1956) was used to study the dataset in a reduced dimensional space. For this analysis, Singular Value Decomposition was applied to the centered covariance matrix for the fractional abundance of each brGDGT using the `svd()` R function. Following Overland & Preisendorfer (1982), a Rule N test was used to evaluate the significance of the obtained modes. This was performed in R using 10,000 Monte Carlo simulations and a 95% confidence interval.

2.5. Indices

brGDGTs are named with roman numerals $I, II, III$ to denote whether they contain 4, 5, or 6 methyl groups, and lowercase $a, b, c$ to denote whether they contain 0, 1, or 2 cyclopentane rings. In addition, the $'$ symbol is used to indicate the 6-methyl isomers.

The $MBT'_{5Me}$ and $CBT'$ indices are used to quantify the relative degree of methylation and the combined cyclization and isomerization response, respectively. These were calculated following De Jonge et al. (2014a):

$$MBT'_{5Me} = \frac{(Ia + Ib + Ic)}{(Ia + Ib + Ic + IIa + IIb + IIc + IIIa)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

$$CBT' = \log_{10} \left( \frac{Ic + IIa' + IIb' + IIIc' + IIIIa' + IIIIb' + IIIIc'}{Ia + IIa + IIIa} \right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)
To further investigate the role of methylation on the brGDGT species we also calculated the MBT index for the 6’ isomers as described in Dang et al. (2016b):

\[
MBT'_{6Me} = \frac{(Ia + Ib + Ic)}{(Ia + Ib + Ic + IIa' + IIb' + IIc' + IIIa')} 
\]

We also compute the isomer ratio proposed by De Jonge et al. (2014b) with the modifications made by Dang et al. (2016a), which represents the relative abundance of 6’ isomers:

\[
IR = \frac{\Sigma(II') + \Sigma(III')}{\Sigma(II) + \Sigma(III) + \Sigma(IV) + \Sigma(VI')} 
\]

Following Martínez-Sosa & Tierney (2019), we calculated the fractional cyclization index (fC) to quantify the relative cyclization of brGDGTs:

\[
fC = \frac{\Sigma(b) + 2\Sigma(c) + \Sigma(b') + 2\Sigma(c')}{\Sigma(a) + \Sigma(b) + \Sigma(c) + \Sigma(b') + \Sigma(c')} \times 0.5 
\]

### 2.6. Calibration

For the calibration of the dataset, a Bayesian model was calculated in MATLAB using the BayMBT package (Dearing Crampton-Flood et al., 2020). We applied the \texttt{baymbt\_model()} function using the same assumptions as Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020). We identified outliers from the calibration by applying the \texttt{rosnerTest} function from the \texttt{EnvStarts} R package over the residuals (Millard et al., 2018).

### 2.7. Basin Pond core

To test our calibration, we applied it to a downcore record of the MBT'_{5Me} index from Basin Pond, ME, USA (Miller et al., 2018). This record spans 900 years and is one of the few lake records where the Hopmans et al. (2016) HPLC method is applied. We used the slope, intercept, and error variance parameters calculated from our global calibration and applied them to the Basin Pond MBT'_{5Me} record through the \texttt{baymbt\_predict()} MATLAB function. To estimate the prior value, we used the Russell et al. (2018) calibration to calculate
a mean temperature for the record, and following (Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. 2020) we used a standard deviation of 10°C.

We compared our reconstruction to temperature data from a nearby weather station located in Farmington, ME (Lawrimore et al. 2011), located 26 km northeast of Basin Pond. The station’s instrumental record spans 128 years (1891–2019) which we used to calculate seasonal averages, MAAT and MAF.

3. Results

3.1. Environmental Parameter Distribution

MAF at our sites range from 1.6 to 28.1°C (Fig. 2a). pH values range from 4.3 to 10 (Fig. 2b), but only a few sites are truly acidic lakes (pH < 6). MAP values range from 69.4 to 3818 mm/year (Fig. 2c), with most of the data falling below 150 mm/month. The available conductivity data ranges from 0 to 20,000,000 µS/cm (Fig. 2d). While most of our lakes fall within the fresh water range (< 500 µS/cm), some are hypersaline and/or alkaline lakes (i.e. Mono Lake, Lake Van, Big Soda Lake, and the Dead Sea). Our samples span a range of water depths from 0 to 377 m (Fig. 2e). The maximum depth of the lakes, where available, spans from 1 to 695 m.

To assess the relationships between environmental factors, we calculated the Spearman correlation for each combination of factors (Table 1). While many combinations have small and/or insignificant correlation values, we also observe some strongly correlated parameters, such as pH and conductivity (0.62), MAF and conductivity (0.55), as well as precipitation and conductivity (-0.78).

3.2. EOF Analysis and Correlation with Environmental Parameters

Our EOF analysis on the brGDGT fractional abundances of the dataset suggests that only the first mode is statistically significant based on a Rule N test, and explains 86% of the variability. Even though our test deemed it insignificant, we retained Mode 2 for our analyses because the scree plot (not shown) suggests that it behaves differently from higher modes, and it explains 12% of
the variance. To gain better insight on the possible environmental significance of each mode we examined the loading of each brGDGT (Fig. 3a). BrGDGTs Ia and IIIa load prominently on Mode 1, with opposing signs (Fig. 3a). Some other minor contributors to the mode are IIIa’ and IIa, with the same sign as IIIa; as well as IIa’ and Ib, which load with Ia. The majority of the brGDGTs contributing to Mode 1 are used in the MBT’\textsubscript{5Me} calculation (Equation 1), with the exception of the low-abundance molecules (i.e. Ic and IIc). Mode 2 on the other hand shows that Ia, IIa and IIIa load with a similar weight and sign, while Ib, IIa’, IIb, IIb’, and IIIa’ contribute with the opposite sign (Fig. 3b). The brGDGT compounds contributing to this mode are all included in the CBT’ index calculation (Equation 2).

We then compared the correlations between each mode and the available environmental parameters to understand the environmental processes that they might be reflecting (Table 2). Except for MAP, all variables show a significant correlation with Mode 1, with MAF and MAAT showing the highest correlations. MAF has a stronger correlation with Mode 1 than MAAT (\(\rho = 0.84\) and 0.81, respectively). Mode 2 has significant correlations with most of the environmental parameters except water depth, but is most strongly correlated with MAP, pH and conductivity (0.53, -0.52 and -0.80, respectively). Mode 2 has a small correlation with temperature (-0.31 and -0.18 for MAF and MAAT respectively).

3.3. Comparison with brGDGT indices

Since the two leading modes are influenced by a similar set of brGDGTs as the MBT’\textsubscript{5Me} and CBT’ indices, respectively, we compared their correlations with temperature and pH (Figs. 4 and 5). Mode 1 and MBT’\textsubscript{5Me} have very similar relationships with MAAT and MAF (Fig. 1), where MAF shows a stronger correlation with both parameters. MBT’\textsubscript{5Me} has a better correlation with MAF than with MAAT (0.86 and 0.82 respectively). Likewise, CBT’ and Mode 2 have a comparable magnitude of correlation (0.53 and -0.54 respectively) with pH (Fig. 5). Similar to Mode 2, CBT’ has a significant correlation with
all parameters but depth (Table 3). Furthermore, just as with Mode 2, $CBT'$ shows a strong correlation with conductivity ($0.81$, Table 3).

We also tested the correlation between other previously reported indices ($MBT'_6$, $IR$, and $fC$) and the environmental parameters (Table 3). $MBT'_6$ has significant correlations with MAF, MAAT, MAP and conductivity. $IR$ has significant correlations with all parameters except for water depth, but correlates most strongly with MAF ($0.64$) and conductivity ($0.76$). $fC$ has significant correlations with all parameters except depth. Similar to $IR$, its strongest correlations are with MAF, MAAT, and conductivity. Nevertheless, none of these indices show a better correlation with MAF or pH and conductivity than $MBT'_5$ and $CBT'$ respectively.

3.4. Temperature Calibration

Due to the overall better correlation between $MBT'_5$ with MAF, we chose this parameter to construct our calibration. Our Bayesian model has good fit to the data, with an $R^2 = 0.85$ and an $RMSE = 2.7^\circ C$ (Fig. 6a). This model covers a wide range of MAF temperatures, with an upper limit of $28.1^\circ C$ and a lower limit of $0^\circ C$ (due to the definition of MAF). MAF residuals from the calibration show no significant trend (Fig. 6b). Furthermore, these residuals show no spatial pattern (not shown) nor a significant correlation with pH or conductivity. However the residuals do have a weak but significant correlation ($p < 0.05$) with water depth ($\rho = 0.26$) and precipitation ($\rho = -0.16$).

3.5. Paleoclimate Application

We applied the Bayesian calibration to the Basin Pond record (Fig. 7). Our reconstruction is similar ($r = 0.99$) to the one generated using the African lakes calibration [Russell et al. 2018]. A reconstruction using the regression of [Dang et al. 2018] plots $\sim 3^\circ C$ colder than the other two reconstructions, and lies outside of the $1\sigma$ error of the Bayesian model. [Dang et al. 2018] used a multiple linear regression based on fractional abundances of individual brGDGTs to generate their calibration, which explains the lower correlation.
with our reconstruction ($r = 0.73$). To assess the validity of our reconstruction, we compared it with the monthly instrumental record from the weather station in Farmington, ME (26 km NE of Basin Pond). Our reconstruction plots close to MAF calculated from the station data, and as expected, above MAAT (Fig. 7b).

3.6. Comparison with Soils and Peats

Finally, we compare the lake data compiled in this work with the soil and peat data from Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020) (Fig. 8). In general, soils have higher $MBT_{5Me}^\prime$ values than lakes for a given temperature. The Bayesian models for each dataset reflect this (Fig. 8 brown and green lines), showing distinctly different y-intercepts.

While at first glance, the slopes of regression lines for soils and lakes seem similar (0.024 and 0.030, respectively), a T-test (Long & Rippeteau, 1974) performed on the distribution of slope values produced by BayMBT shows that they are significantly different ($p < 0.05$). As observed by Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020), the soil data have a wider spread at intermediate temperatures, a feature that does not appear to be as pronounced in the lake data.

We further compared the response of $CBT^\prime$ to pH in both datasets (Fig. 9). Linear regression indicates that soils and lakes have very different slopes (0.50 and 0.16, respectively). While the regression for soils has an $R^2 = 0.73$, the $R^2$ of the lake regression is only 0.27.

4. Discussion

4.1. EOF Modes

Our EOF analysis shows that a substantial amount of the variability in our lake dataset (98%) can be explained by the first two modes. Assuming that these modes reflect single environmental factors, this suggests that other environmental parameters exert only a minor influence on the brGDGT proxy in lakes, at least on the global scale. Of the two modes, Mode 1 explains most
of the variance (86%) suggesting that the phenomena captured by this mode dominates the brGDGT response.

4.1.1. Mode 1

We interpret Mode 1 to reflect the influence of temperature on brGDGT distributions. It strongly correlates with both MAAT and MAF, and has smaller correlations with pH and conductivity (Table 2). In addition, the brGDGTs that load most prominently on Mode 1 (Fig. 3) are similar to those involved in the calculation of $MBT_{5Me}'$ (Equation 1), the established index for relative methylation that has already been shown to respond to temperature.

While Mode 1 and $MBT_{5Me}'$ share the major contributors ($I\alpha$, $Ib$, $II\alpha$, $III\alpha$), the remaining brGDGT compounds behave slightly differently; $IIb$ and $Iic$ contribute to $MBT_{5Me}'$, while $III\alpha'$ and $IIa'$ contribute to Mode 1. The fact that these latter compounds load on Mode 1 suggests that, contrary to the assumption that the temperature sensitivity is limited to the 5-methyl brGDGTs, 6-methyl brGDGTs may also be slightly temperature sensitive, at least in lakes (Dang et al., 2018). However, Mode 1 and $MBT_{5Me}'$ have very similar correlations with temperatures (Fig. 4), which suggests to us that inclusion of additional brGDGTs in Mode 1 does not provide substantial additional information. Given the widespread use of $MBT_{5Me}'$ (and the fact that our Mode 1 is nearly identical) we consider it the preferred metric for capturing the temperature sensitivity of brGDGT distributions and use it for further analyses in this work.

Both Mode 1 and $MBT_{5Me}'$ have a stronger correlation with MAF than MAAT (Fig. 4). In particular, the use of MAF brings the colder lakes from the East African dataset (Russell et al., 2018) (which do not freeze on a seasonal basis) into alignment with the seasonally-frozen mid- and high-latitude lakes in our dataset and the Dang et al. dataset (Dang et al., 2016a, 2018). This suggests that brGDGT producers are limited to a growing season; i.e., may not be active when lakes are frozen during the winter (Miller et al., 2018; Loomis et al., 2014). This agrees with previous calibration studies, which likewise show
a better correlation with MAF in soils and peats and thus assume that the producers are not active at below-freezing temperatures (Dearing Crampton-Flood et al., 2020; Naafs et al., 2017a).

4.1.2. Mode 2

We interpret Mode 2 as a reflection of water chemistry, as it is strongly correlated with lake pH and conductivity (Table 2). Mode 2 does have a significant, but weak, correlation with MAF ($\rho = -0.31$), however this most likely reflects the correlation between MAF and both pH and conductivity present in our environmental data (Table 1). $CBT^\prime$, which has been used as a pH index, behaves similarly to Mode 2 (Table 3), and the two indices are influenced by the same group of brGDGTs (Fig. 3b and Equation 2), with a few exceptions ($Ib$ and $IIb$ participate in Mode 2). Interestingly, the correlations with conductivity (ca. 0.8) are much higher than with pH (ca. 0.5) for both Mode 2 and $CBT^\prime$, which could suggest that brGDGT distributions are sensitive to anion concentrations in addition to the acidity of the water. However, since pH and conductivity are closely linked, it is difficult to discern a causal relationship from the strength of these correlations. The strong relationship with conductivity could simply reflect the fact that this measurement is easier to make in the field than pH, and potentially more accurate (since pH meters need to be calibrated). Furthermore, we have fewer measurements of conductivity ($N=119$) than pH ($N=178$), which could inflate the correlation value for conductivity.

While Mode 2 suggests that water chemistry affects brGDGT distributions, this mode only accounts for 12% of the variance in the dataset, and it is not significant at the $p < 0.05$ threshold. This might explain the ambiguous pH response observed in other empirical lake studies (Russell et al., 2018; Sun et al., 2011), as well as in controlled incubations of lake water (Martínez-Sosa et al., 2020). In contrast, pH has been shown to exert a clear influence on peat (Naafs et al., 2017b) and soil brGDGT distributions (Naafs et al., 2017a; Xiao et al., 2015). Given that our dataset spans a large pH range (4.3–10) it is unlikely that the weak relationship we observe is due to sampling bias. It is possible that the
strong correlation with pH in soils and peats partly reflects an effect of soil moisture (Naafs et al., 2017a; Dang et al., 2016a), which is lost in lacustrine environments. Another possibility, supported by previous works (De Jonge et al., 2019; Weber et al., 2018), is that the microbial communities responsible for producing brGDGTs in soils and lakes are different, and thus have characteristic responses to temperature and pH.

Given our finding that the water chemistry effect is weak, we refrain from developing a pH or conductivity calibration for lakes.

4.2. Additional indices

IR and fC, indices for the relative degree of isomerization and cyclization, show moderately strong correlations with MAF, conductivity, and pH (ρ = 0.65, 0.77, and 0.47 for IR; 0.64, 0.57, 0.46 for fC). The observed relationship to temperature supports our previous microcosm results, which similarly indicate that isomerization and cyclization have thermal sensitivity (Martínez-Sosa et al., 2020). However, since water chemistry exerts an equal (if not larger, in the case of IR) influence on these indices, they are not as useful as MBT’ 5 Me for paleothermometry. Conversely, the influence of temperature limits the utility of IR and fC for water chemistry reconstruction (pH or conductivity). As discussed, the sensitivity of brGDGTs to water chemistry is better captured by CBT’, which is a combined metric of isomerization and cyclization.

4.3. Temperature Calibration

Our EOF analysis demonstrates that temperature is the primary influence on brGDGT distribution in lakes on the global scale. Furthermore, our results suggest that the use of MAF, as an alternative to MAAT, improves the correlation with MBT’ 5 Me, as it accounts for the seasonally biased response observed in the mid to high latitudes, which likely reflects reduced microbial activity (Dearing Crampton-Flood et al., 2020). This allows us to construct a universal lakes calibration for paleoclimate applications, using the Bayesian model developed by Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020). The Bayesian approach
allows us to present MAF as the independent variable and, since the Bayesian method generates an ensemble of possible regression parameters, the calibration accounts for both parameter and residual uncertainties. Furthermore, Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020) showed that the use of ordinary least squares regression with MAF as the dependent variable leads to regression dilution, thus making the Bayesian model a more suitable approach.

Our calibration has an $R^2 = 0.85$, comparable with previous calibrations (Dearing Crampton-Flood et al., 2020; Naafs et al., 2017a; De Jonge et al., 2014a) but lower than the one presented by Russell et al. (2018) of 0.92. This likely reflects the larger number of samples (spanning a greater diversity of climate and geography) included in this work, although both calibrations have comparable RMSE values (2.4°C and 2.7°C). Our calibration residuals do not show any trends with temperature (Fig. 6b), as expected from the model.

In the process of developing the temperature calibration, a Rosner test (Rosner, 1983) identified six outliers (Fig. 6a), which we ultimately excluded from the final calibration. These outliers come from all three studies, which suggests they are not related to laboratory-specific procedures. Rather, they seem to be related to extreme water chemistry—five out of six of the outliers come from alkaline, saline lakes. Two of the outlying samples are from the western USA: Mono Lake and Big Soda Lake. Mono lake has a pH of 9.7 and conductivity of 80,000 $\mu$S/cm (Jiang et al. 2004; Domagalski et al. 1989), and Big Soda lake has a pH of 9.7 and conductivity of about 20,000 $\mu$S/cm (Priscu et al. 1982; Kharaka et al. 1984). Big Soda Lake also has an unusual dichothermal water column profile as a consequence of its high salt content (Priscu et al. 1982), which might influence both the microbial communities present and the brGDGT response. Two additional outliers come from Chile: Laguna Amarga and Laguna del Negro Francisco. Both are shallow (4.1 and 1 m, maximum depth respectively) endorheic basins. Laguna Amarga has a pH of 8.4 and a conductivity of 52,367 $\mu$S/cm (Campos et al. 1995), while Laguna del Negro Francisco is a hypersaline (80,000 $\mu$S/cm) lagoon (Grosjean et al. 1997). A fifth outlier is Lake Qinghai, in China. Qinghai is also alkaline and saline, with
a conductivity of 19,970 μS/cm and a pH of 8.7 (Yang et al., 2003). The sixth outlier, Mahuhura lake from Uganda, is the only outlying site that is not saline; its conductivity is 600 μS/cm. However, it is alkaline, with a pH of 8.9 (Gelorini et al., 2011).

While the observed outliers are nearly all highly alkaline/saline lakes, it is important to note that there are other lakes in our dataset that have either high pH (i.e. Lake Van with pH = 9.8) or high conductivity (i.e. Lake Daihai, 15,647 μS/cm) and fall well within the confidence interval of our calibration. Our calibration also includes a sample from the Dead Sea (Neugebauer et al., 2014), which has an extremely high conductivity of 202 mS/cm (Akawwi et al., 2011) but a pH of only 6 (Sass & Ben-Yaakov, 1977). This sample, while on the margin of our confidence interval, is not an outlier, which suggests that it is the combined effect of salinity and alkalinity that leads to outlying brGDGT distributions. Our observation that alkaline, saline lakes tend to have outlying brGDGT distributions is in line with results presented by Tierney et al. (2010), in which lakes from Africa with conductivities above 30,000 μS/cm showed distinct brGDGT distributions compared with the rest of the dataset (< 5,900 μS/cm).

There are several possible explanations for the deviant behavior of brGDGT distributions in alkaline, saline lakes. For one, these types of lakes have a restricted bacterial diversity (Humayoun et al., 2003), so it seems likely that the microbial community responsible for the brGDGT production in these environments is distinct from the communities found in more neutral, freshwater lakes, and thus may have a completely different sensitivity to environmental perturbations. Alternatively, the water chemistry of these environments may be extreme enough to directly influence brGDGT methylation. Excluding Mahuhura, all of the outliers have higher-than-expected $MBT'_{5,Me}$ for their given temperature, suggesting that less methylated brGDGTs are favored under alkaline, saline conditions. While higher than estimated $MBT'_{5,Me}$ values might also indicate that in these extreme water chemistries, there is a preferential loss of the more methylated compounds during diagenesis, we also observe higher $IR$ values in
the outliers, suggesting a preference for the $6'$ isomers either due to higher soil inputs, or in situ production from a distinct producer. Given the limited sample size of these extreme environments, it is difficult to generalize, but the observed trend agrees with previous work (Tierney et al., 2010), and should be further explored.

Alkaline, saline environments aside, the good fit of our model to globally-distributed values of $MBT'_{5Me}$ demonstrates that brGDGT response to temperature is mostly unaffected by additional physical and chemical factors. Further evidence of this comes from the weak and statistically insignificant correlations between the model residuals and most environmental parameters ($\rho < 0.05$, not shown). There is a weak correlation between our model residuals and water depth ($\rho = 0.26$), as well as with precipitation ($\rho = -0.16$). Notably, the correlation with water depth is significant only for shallow (< 20 m) lakes ($\rho = 0.25$, Fig. 10a), not deep lakes ($\rho = -0.17$, Fig. 10a). The correlation is such that the shallowest lakes have negative residuals, indicating that brGDGTs predict higher-than-expected temperatures. Investigating this relationship further, we found that the correlation is stronger ($\rho = 0.41$) if we consider only the temperate lakes (> 35°N and S) within our data set ($n = 111$; Fig. 10b), and is not significant for the shallow tropical lakes ($n = 96$). We attribute this to an increased influence of thermal variability in temperate lakes. Unlike tropical lakes, which experience a restricted seasonal changes in air temperature (Russell et al., 2018), temperate lakes—especially shallow ones—are subject to large swings in temperature both seasonally and diurnally. Thus the apparent influence of water depth on brGDGT distributions in shallow temperate lakes could reflect water temperatures that seasonally or diurnally exceed MAF. Alternatively, the observed warm bias could indicate greater input of soil-derived brGDGTs in shallow lake systems. However, were this the case, we would expect to see a similar phenomenon in shallow tropical lakes, where there is a clear offset between soil and lake brGDGTs (Tierney et al., 2010; Russell et al., 2018). A third possibility is that the trend from negative to positive residuals reflects an increasing contribution of in situ production at depth (i.e., at or near
the thermocline), which would result in lower inferred temperatures in deeper lakes. However, if this were the primary explanation, we would expect to see the residual trend persist in deeper lakes, where the thermocline temperatures can be much lower than surface temperatures. Although it is a relatively minor effect, This observed influence of water depth on lacustrine brGDGTs deserves further investigation.

4.4. Paleoclimate Application

When we apply our new temperature calibration to brGDGTs at Basin Pond, we obtain temperatures that are on average $\sim 0.7\, ^\circ C$ lower than the Russell et al. (2018) calibration (Fig. 7a). However, since our calibration includes a larger variety of geographic and environmental settings, including samples from the northeast USA, it might be more appropriate for the Basin Pond site. Even though the lake core has a lower resolution than the instrumental record, it is impressive that MAF from the latter falls within the $1\sigma$ range of our reconstruction, with an average difference of $1\, ^\circ C$. This suggests that our new global calibration provides reasonably accurate estimates of MAF.

4.5. Soils vs Lakes

$MBT'_{5Me}$ in soils and peats (Dearing Crampton-Flood et al., 2020) has a reduced sensitivity to temperature (i.e., lower slope) than lakes (Figure 8). There is also a large difference in the y-intercept terms between the soils and lakes BayMBT model, which reflects the tendency of lacustrine environments to have lower $MBT'_{5Me}$ values compared with soils at a given temperature. This effect has been previously reported as a “cold bias” when applying soil calibration to lake records (Russell et al., 2018; Tierney et al., 2010). Lipid and sequencing analyses have shown that the microbial communities responsible for the production of brGDGTs in soils and lakes might be different (De Jonge et al., 2019; Weber et al., 2018, 2015), a factor which could explain this consistent offset between both datasets. Alternatively, it is possible that interfering factors, such as soil moisture (Dang et al., 2016b) could be affecting the sensitivity of brGDGTs
in soils. Despite the difference in values, the datasets overlap, particularly below 20°C. This could partially reflect input of soil-derived GDGTs into our lake sites, a factor that we cannot constrain. Nevertheless, our samples have a lower dispersion (RMSE = 2.7°C) compared with soils (RMSE = 3.8°C), which could imply that soil input has a relatively small influence on lacustrine brGDGTs.

As a naive approach to the system, we tested the performance of a brGDGT calibration that includes soils, peats, and lakes (Fig. 8 solid black line). We observe that the $R^2$ is lower than the observed for both independent calibrations (0.67), and the RMSE increases (4.2°C), nevertheless these values are within the range reported for the soil calibration [Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. 2020]. While we recommend that specific calibrations should be used for soil vs. lacustrine samples, this naive calibration could be useful for deep-time applications where the nature of the environment is unclear, or is suspected to have changed through time [Inglis et al. 2019].

Finally, we find that $CBT'$ is less sensitive to pH in our lake dataset than in soils and peats (Fig. 9). This result further stresses the possibility that the pH response observed in soils could be driven by moisture [Naafs et al. 2017b; Dang et al. 2016a] or the possibility that the source organisms in soils and lakes are different [De Jonge et al. 2019; Weber et al. 2018]. Furthermore, this further supports the idea that soil input has only a small influence on lacustrine brGDGTs, since the correlation between $CBT'$ and pH differs so much in soils and lakes ($\rho = 0.82$, and 0.53 respectively). Given this observation, and the fact that water chemistry explains only 12% of the variance in our brGDGT data, we do not recommend using lacustrine brGDGTs to reconstruct pH.

5. Conclusions

In this work we present a globally distributed dataset of brGDGTs in lacustrine core top sediments. In agreement with previous empirical and laboratory studies we find that temperature, particularly the mean temperature above freezing, has the largest influence on the brGDGT response. Our EOF analysis
corroborates that the molecules involved in the $MBT_{5Me}$ calculation show the best correlation to this parameter. Water chemistry, either pH or conductivity, exerts a weak influence on brGDGT distributions, which leads us to recommend against the use of brGDGT distributions to reconstruct water pH.

Our global Bayesian calibration improves on previous works by expanding the sample size and number of locations, accounting for uncertainties in both the calibration parameters and residual error, as well as resolving the regression dilution bias that emerges in traditional ordinary least squares models. While care should be taken when working with highly alkaline, hypersaline systems, the Bayesian lake calibration presented here is robust across a wide range of environmental regimes. The lakes BayMBT model has a steeper slope and lower intercept than the soils model, which suggests that soil and lake-specific calibrations should be used whenever possible in order to obtain the most accurate temperature estimation. However, our naive calibration provides an alternative option for deep-time applications where the paleo-environment may be unclear.

6. Research Data

Data associated with article is available on the Pangaea database [link will be inserted when ready].
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Figure 1: World map showing the location of the samples included in this dataset. Samples are color coded based to their source. Purple points represent samples from our dataset, Green points are samples derived from Russell et al. (2018). Orange samples represent sites included in Dang et al. (2018) and Dang et al. (2016a).
Figure 2: Distribution of environmental parameters in the complete dataset, number of samples with available data shown on top right. a) Mean Temperature of Months Above Freezing (> 0°C), b) pH, c) Mean annual precipitation (mm/month), d) Conductivity, e) Water Depth, and f) Maximum lake depth.
Figure 3: Loadings calculated through EOF analysis for each brGDGT for a) Mode 1, and b) Mode 2.
Figure 4: Scatter plots of MAAT (a and c), and MAF (b and d) against values for Mode 1 (a and b) and $MBT_{5Me}'$ (c and d). Correlation values are presented for each plot. Samples are color coded following Figure 1.
Figure 5: Scatter plots of pH against values for a) Mode 2, and b) CBT'. Correlation values are presented for each plot. Samples are color coded following Figure 1.
Figure 6: Bayesian regression calculated for $MBT'_{5Me}$ as a function of MAF. a) Scatter plot showing the regression with fitted line (solid red) and the 95% Confidence Interval (dotted red) for the dataset without outliers (labeled and shown in grey). Calculated $R^2$ and RMSE values for the regression are indicated in the corner. b) Residuals plotted against MAF.
Figure 7: Temperature reconstruction for the Basin Pond record (Miller et al., 2018). a) Reconstructions using the Russell et al. (2018), Dang et al. (2018), and the Bayesian calibration from this work are shown in green, orange and purple, respectively. Purple shaded area indicates the 1σ error range for the Bayesian results. b) BayMBT median results (purple) with the 1σ bounds (shaded purple area) compared with the instrumental record (1891–2019) from Farmington, ME. Record for MAAT is shown as a gray line, MAF shown as a black line.
Figure 8: Scatter plot of $MBT'_{5Me}$ as a function of MAF for soils and peats (brown, Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020)) and lakes (green, this study). Bayesian calibration curves, $R^2$, and RMSE values for soils (brown), lakes (green), and for the combined dataset (black) with the 95% CI (dotted black).
Figure 9: Scatter plot and linear regressions of $CBT'$ as a function of pH for soil and peat samples (brown, Dearing Crampton-Flood et al. (2020)) and lakes (green, this study). $R^2$ values for each regression shown on top left.
Figure 10: Scatter plots and correlations of the calibration residuals as a function of the log\textsubscript{10} of depth. a) Lakes are separated into shallow (red, < 20 m) and deep (black, > 20 m) groups. The Spearman correlation for each subset is shown; asterisks mark significant correlations (p < 0.05). b) Shallow lakes from temperate latitudes (> 35°N and S). Spearman correlation is shown.
### Table 1: Spearman correlation values for each pair of environmental parameters considered in our dataset. Statistically significant correlations ($\rho < 0.05$) are marked with an *.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAF - pH</td>
<td>0.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - MAP</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - Depth</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAF - Conductivity</td>
<td>0.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH - MAP</td>
<td>-0.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH - Depth</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH - Conductivity</td>
<td>0.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP - Depth</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP - Conductivity</td>
<td>-0.78*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity - Depth</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: Spearman correlation values for both Modes and all studied environmental parameters. Statistically significant correlations ($\rho < 0.05$) are marked with an *.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Mode 1</th>
<th>Mode 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAF</td>
<td>0.84*</td>
<td>-0.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAAT</td>
<td>0.81*</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>-0.54*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conductivity</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>-0.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>-0.14*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Spearman correlation values for calculated indices and environmental parameters. Statistically significant correlations ($\rho < 0.05$) are marked with an *.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>MAF</th>
<th>MAAT</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>MAP</th>
<th>Conductivity</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$MBT'_{5Me}$</td>
<td>0.86*</td>
<td>0.82*</td>
<td>0.35*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$MBT'_{6Me}$</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.39*</td>
<td>-0.32*</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$CBT'$</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>-0.55*</td>
<td>0.81*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$IR$</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>0.76*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$fC$</td>
<td>0.64*</td>
<td>0.60*</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>