



Naafs, D., Inglis, G., Zheng, Y., Amesbury, M., Biester, H., Bindler, R., Blewett, J., Burrows, M. A., del Castillo Torres, D., Chambers, F. M., Cohen, A. D., Evershed, R., Feakins, S. J., Gałka, M., Gallego-Sala, A., Gandois, L., Gray, D. M., Hatcher, P.G., Honorio Coronado, E. N., ... Pancost, R. (2017). Introducing global peat-specific temperature and pH calibrations based on brGDGT bacterial lipids. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 208, 285-301.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2017.01.038>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

License (if available):
CC BY

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1016/j.gca.2017.01.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gca.2017.01.038)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via Elsevier at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0016703717300522>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Table 1: List of peatlands used in this study

Country	Peat location/name	Latitude	Longitude	Altitude (m)	Mean annual air temp. (°C)	pH	pH range (±)	#samples analyzed	Sample extraction method
Ireland	Ballyduff Bog	53.1	-8.0	60	8.3	4	0.25	9	1
UK	Butterburn Flow	55.1	-2.5	280	8.0	4.15	0.15	7	1
Germany	Bissendorfer Moor	52.5	9.7	52	8.9	4	0.25	8	1
Finland	Kontolanrahka	60.8	22.8	87	4.4	4	0.25	5	1
Peru	Aucayacu	-3.9	-74.4	100	26.4	3.7	0.2	5	2
Peru	Roca Fuerte	-4.4	-74.8	100	26.4	4.15	0.45	13	2
Peru	Riñón	-4.9	-74.0	100	26.6	<i>n.d.</i>		1	2
Peru	Maquíá	-6.3	-74.8	100	25.8	6.1	0.4	4	2
Peru	Buena Vista del Maquíá	-6.2	-74.7	100	25.8	6	0.2	8	2
Peru	Miraflores	-4.4	-74.1	100	26.6	3.75	0.15	8	2
Peru	Nueva York	-4.4	-74.3	100	26.6	3.95	0.05	8	2
Peru	Nueva Alianza	-4.7	-75.4	100	26.4	5.7	0.3	4	2
Peru	Tacshacocha	-4.9	-74.3	100	26.7	5.1	0.3	4	2
Peru	Quistococha	-3.8	-73.3	100	26.4	<i>n.d.</i>		3	2
Peru	San Jorge	-4.1	-73.2	100	26.4	4	0.5	10	2
France	Fransne, Jura Mountains	46.8	6.2	840	9.6	3.5	0.5	16	3
France	La Guette, Sologne	47.3	2.3	154	11.0	4	0.25	4	4
Switzerland	Lörmoos	47.0	7.4	585	9.0	4.32	0.07	2	4
Switzerland	Praz Rodet	46.6	6.2	1040	9.6	4.26	0.0	2	4
Switzerland	Sortel	46.7	7.4	1406	4.3	4.82	0.14	2	4
Switzerland	Hochrajen	46.6	8.0	1885	1.5	4.55	0.07	2	4
Tanzania	Kyambangunguru	-9.4	33.8	663	24.4	5.4		4	5
Poland	Kojle Lake	54.3	22.9	148.5	6.3	<i>n.d.</i>		2	4
Latvia	Teici Bog	56.6	26.5	100	5.0	<i>n.d.</i>		2	4
Romania	Poiana Siol	47.6	24.8	1540	2.3	<i>n.d.</i>		2	4
China	Tibetan Plateau	32.8	102.5	3500	-1.0	5.5	0.5	8	2
Argentina	Andorra	-54.7	-68.3	180	4.5	5.4	0.7	13	2
Queensland	Bomfield Swamp	-17.4	145.5	754	21.1	6.5	1	14	2
Chile	SKY1	-52.5	-72.1	20	6.5	4.25	0.25	6	2
Indonesia	Sebangau/Saganbau	-2.3	113.9	30	26.5	3	0.3	11	2
USA	Okefenokee Swamp	30.6	-82.3	0	20.5	4	0.2	3	2
USA	Dismal Swamp	36.7	-76.6	4	15.7	4	0.5	1	2
USA	North Carolina Peat	35.0	-77.0	<i>n.d.</i>	17.1	3.7	0.25	1	2
USA	Shark River peat	25.2	-81.0	0	24.5	6.51	0.25	1	2

USA	Tamiami Sawgrass Peat	26.0	-81.0	<i>n.d.</i>	23.9	7.14	0.25	1	2
USA	Loxahatchee Sawgrass Peat	26.0	-80.5	<i>n.d.</i>	24.7	6.65	0.25	1	2
USA	Loxahatchee Nymphaea Peat	26.0	-80.5	<i>n.d.</i>	24.7	7.94	0.25	1	2
USA	Snuggedy Swamp Peat	32.0	-81.3	<i>n.d.</i>	19.3	<i>n.d.</i>		1	2
USA	New York Peat (Fort Drum)	44.0	-75.0	<i>n.d.</i>	6.5	7.85	0.25	1	2
USA	Maine Sphagnum peat	45.0	-68.0	<i>n.d.</i>	5.7	4.28	0.25	1	2
Spain	Chao de Veiga Mol	43.5	-7.5	695	12.4	4.1	1.5	8	2
Spain	Borralleiras da Cal Grande	43.6	-7.5	600	13.9	4.1	1.5	6	2
Spain	Zalama	43.1	-3.4	1330	12.1	4.65	0.15	8	2
Iran	Peat near Neor Lake	38.0	48.6	2500	4.8	<i>n.d.</i>		7	2
Brazil	Pau de Fruta	-18.3	-43.7	1360	19.4	3.8	0.2	6	2
Brazil	São João da Chapada	-18.1	-43.8	1342	19.4	3.9	0.3	5	2
Brazil	Sempre Viva	-17.9	-43.8	1260	19.4	3.3	0.5	5	2
Brazil	Pinheiros	-18.1	-43.7	1242	19.4	3.7	0.3	6	2
Russia	Igarka Site 1+2	67.5	86.6	128	-8.3	<i>n.d.</i>		6	2
UK	Walton Moss	55.0	-2.8	100	8.1	<i>n.d.</i>		6	2
USA	Brendan State Forest	39.9	-74.5	<i>n.d.</i>	12.5	<i>n.d.</i>		8	2
Sweden	Stordalen	68.4	19.1	350	-1.3	3.4	0.4	6	2
Belgium	Poleur	50.5	6.0	528	7.5	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
UK	Bodmin Moor	50.6	-4.6	269	8.6	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
France	Demoiselle	48.1	6.5	545	6.0	<i>n.d.</i>		3	2
Argentina	Harberton	-54.9	-67.2	69	4.0	<i>n.d.</i>		8	2
Poland	Kosova mire	53.8	16.6	130	7.8	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
France	Tanet	48.1	7.1	1254	5.1	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
France	OHM Vicdessos	42.8	1.4	1799	3.8	<i>n.d.</i>		3	2
Sweden	Storamyran	63.7	20.1	46	4.0	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Switzerland	Simplon	46.2	8.0	2055	5.5	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Iceland	Fjallsjökull	64.0	16.4	29	4.0	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Switzerland	Fachepremont	46.1	7.0	1070	3.5	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
France	Pinet Fosse	42.9	2.0	880	8.4	<i>n.d.</i>		3	2
Poland	Linje mire	53.1	18.2	88	8.1	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Norway	N. Norway	69.0	15.3	269	1.6	<i>n.d.</i>		1	2
Iceland	S. Iceland	63.4	-18.8	57	11.3	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Poland	Zamarte mire	53.4	17.6	95	8.0	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Poland	Rzecin mire	52.5	16.2	66	8.5	<i>n.d.</i>		3	2
Switzerland	Flesch	46.2	8.0	1845	5.5	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Switzerland	Hängstli	46.8	7.8	1260	10.8	<i>n.d.</i>		1	2
Kenya	Nyabuiyabui	-0.4	35.8	2901	9.8	<i>n.d.</i>		3	2
Kenya	Shidodo	-1.0	34.0	1192	22.5	<i>n.d.</i>		6	2
Tanzania	Luala	-9.3	34.6	1798	17.9	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Kenya	Marula	-0.2	36.4	2338	14.3	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Tanzania	Kitulu	-9.3	34.7	1964	17.4	<i>n.d.</i>		4	2
Japan	Piyashiri	36.0	139.7	<i>n.d.</i>	14.3	<i>n.d.</i>		6	2
Germany	Harz, Odersprung Bog	52.8	10.6	800	6.2	4.25	0.25	19	2
Canada	Chénéville	45.9	-75.0	200	6.2	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2

Canada	Parc-des-grands-Jardins	47.6	-71.0	820	3.2	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Canada	Peace river	56.4	-116.9	610	-0.3	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Canada	Radisson	53.8	-77.6	160	-3.0	<i>n.d.</i>		5	2
Canada	Sainte-Eulalie	46.1	-72.3	85	5.3	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Canada	Seba beach	53.5	-114.9	810	2.7	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Canada	Shippagan 527	47.7	-64.7	0	4.9	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Canada	SS70-14	60.9	-116.8	220	-3.6	<i>n.d.</i>		2	2
Canada	Waswanipi	49.7	-76.0	305	0.4	<i>n.d.</i>		3	2
Scotland	Kentra Bay 007G	56.7	-5.8	5.8	5.8	5	0.25	9	2
Scotland	Kentra Bay 004D	56.7	-5.8	3.8	5.8	4.85	0.25	11	2
Scotland	Kentra Bay 001A	56.7	-5.8	2.4	5.8	6.12	0.25	10	2
Scotland	Kentra Bay M3	56.7	-5.8	15.8	5.8	4.70	0.25	9	2
Scotland	Kentra Bay M2	56.7	-5.8	5.5	5.8	4.80	0.25	10	2
Scotland	Kentra Bay M4	56.7	-5.8	15.9	5.8	4.74	0.25	10	2
Scotland	Kentra Bay M1	56.7	-5.8	3	5.8	5.49	0.25	9	2
Scotland	Kentra Bay 009I	56.7	-5.8	4.10	5.8	4.87	0.25	10	2
N-Ireland	Fallahogy Bog	54.8	-6.6	46	9.4	<i>n.d.</i>		6	2

¹Lipids ultrasonically extracted using DCM:MeOH (1:1), GDGT distribution analyzed in hydrolyzed polar fractions. See Pancost et al. (2011) for details

²Samples microwave extracted using DCM:MeOH (9:1), GDGT distribution analyzed in fraction of TLE after elution over short silica column (this study)

³Samples extracted using ASE and DCM:MeOH (9:1), GDGT distribution analyzed in polar fraction after elution over silica column, see Huguet et al. (2013) for details

⁴Samples extracted using ASE and DCM:MeOH (9:1), GDGT distribution analyzed in fraction of TLE after elution over short silica column (this study)

⁵Samples extracted using Bligh-Dyer procedure, GDGT distribution analyzed in polar fractions, see Coffinet et al. (2014) for details

Supplementary references

Coffinet, S., Huguet, A., Williamson, D., Fosse, C., Derenne, S., 2014. Potential of GDGTs as a temperature proxy along an altitudinal transect at Mount Rungwe (Tanzania). *Org. Geochem.* **68**, 82-89.

Huguet, A., Fosse, C., Laggoun-Défarge, F., Delarue, F., Derenne, S., 2013. Effects of a short-term experimental microclimate warming on the abundance and distribution of branched GDGTs in a French peatland. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **105**, 294-315.

Pancost, R.D., McClymont, E.L., Bingham, E.M., Roberts, Z., Charman, D.J., Hornibrook, E.R.C., Blundell, A., et al., 2011. Archaeol as a methanogen biomarker in ombrotrophic bogs. *Org. Geochem.* **42** (10), 1279-1287.