

## Zinc and Nickel isotope systematics in the South Atlantic Ocean

C. ARCHER<sup>\*1</sup>, D. VANCE<sup>1</sup>, M. LOHAN<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Inst. of Geochemistry and Petrology, Dept of Earth Sciences, ETH Zürich

(\*corey.archer@erdw.ethz.ch)

<sup>2</sup> Ocean and Earth Science, National Oceanography Centre, University of Southampton

Zinc (Zn) is an essential micronutrient and the most abundant trace metal in diatoms, phytoplankton which play a key role in carbon export from the oceanic photic zone (e.g. [1]). The strong relationship between dissolved Zn and silicon (Si) [2] in the oceans has long remained a puzzle, as Zn is not associated with Si in the diatom frustule. Nickel (Ni) also plays a role as an oceanic micronutrient, and is also correlated with Si [2] and co-located with P in phytoplankton cells. Zn and Ni isotopes in the oceans differ in one key aspect. Zn exhibits significant variation in the upper ocean, but is homogenous below the thermocline (e.g. [3,4]), whereas Ni isotopes appear to be homogenous throughout the ocean [5].

The importance of the Southern Ocean is increasingly recognised as a key control on major nutrient distributions in the global ocean (e.g. [6]). Here we present Zn and Ni data collected as part of two UK-GEOTRACES South Atlantic cruises. Zn shows the expected extreme depletion towards the surface, to sub-nM concentrations. Moreover, though surface Zn concentrations in the South Atlantic decreases by two orders of magnitude from the upwelling zone in the Southern Ocean, this drawdown is also associated with no fractionation [this study, 3], with  $\delta^{66}\text{Zn}$  showing a uniform value of  $\sim 0.5\text{‰}$ , similar to previous estimates of average oceanic dissolved Zn [e.g. 3,4]. This suggests that the main removal process of Zn is not accompanied by an isotopic fractionation, at least in the Southern Ocean. Ni also shows a decrease in concentration towards the surface, but only by a factor of 2-3. At one station Ni has a homogeneous  $\delta^{60}\text{Ni}$  value of  $\sim 1.3\text{‰}$ , whereas  $\delta^{60}\text{Ni}$  increases to  $\sim 1.75\text{‰}$  towards the surface at a second station. These differences in  $\delta^{60}\text{Ni}$  occur in spite of similar concentration profiles at both stations, suggesting at least two mechanisms of Ni removal.

[1] Twining, B.S. *et al.* (2014) *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **59**, 689-704. [2] Bruland, K.W. (1980) *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett* **47** (1980) 176-198. [3] Zhao, Y. *et al.* (2014) *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **125**, 653-672. [4] Conway, T.M. and John, S.G. (2014) *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **28**, 1111-1128. [5] Cameron V. and Vance D. (2014) *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **128**, 195-211. [6] Sarmiento, J.L. *et al.* (2003) *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles*. **21**, 1029/2006GC002720.