X-ray tomographic data of planktonic foraminifera species *Globigerina bulloides* from the Eastern Tropical Atlantic across Termination II

Stergios Zarkogiannis^{a*} (0000-0001-7441-5506), Vincent Fernandez^b (0000-0002-8315-1458), Mervyn Greaves^c (0000-0001-8014-8627), P. Graham Mortyn^{d,e} (0000-0002-9473-4309), George Kontakiotis^a (0000-0001-9371-6726), Assimina Antonarakou^a (0000-0001-8901-8423)

^aFaculty of Geology & Geoenvironment, Department of Historical Geology-Paleontology, School of Earth Sciences, National & Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece; stergiosz@geol.uoa.gr, gkontak@geol.uoa.gr, aantonar@geol.uoa.gr

^bImaging and Analysis Centre, Natural History Museum, London, United Kingdom; v.fernandez@nhm.ac.uk

^cDepartment of Earth Sciences, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK; mg109@cam.ac.uk

^dInstitute of Environmental Science and Technology (ICTA), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain, graham.mortyn@uab.cat

^eDepartment of Geography, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Spain

Abstract

Elevated shell weights of the planktonic foraminifera species *Globigerina bulloides* were recorded during the course of Termination II at a tropical site offshore the Mauritanian coast. In order to investigate these increased shell mass values a series of physicochemical analyses were performed including X-ray computed tomography (CT) and the data are given here. Furthermore, the relevant CT setup, scanning, reconstructing, and visualization methods are explained and the acquired datasets are given together with 3D volumes and models of the scanned specimens.

Revised version submitted to GIGabyte journal on 1-9-2020

Introduction

Planktonic foraminifera are unicellular marine micro-organisms (Protists) that produce calcium carbonate (CaCO₃) shells (tests). Their biomineralization plays a major role in controlling the alkalinity and carbonate chemistry of the photic zone of the world ocean and is intimately related to atmospheric *p*CO₂ and the regional or global budgets of the carbon system [1]. Planktonic foraminifera are known to considerably alter their shell weight throughout the paleoceanographic record [2] and the degree of this alteration is a function of latitude [3]. In the present study [4] of a tropical Atlantic core we report relatively small variation in the shell weights of the planktonic species *Globigerina bulloides*

(NCBI:txid69025; urn:lsid:marinespecies.org:taxname:113434) during the last two climatic cycles with the exception of an increased weight event during Termination II. In order to identify the cause of these elevated shell mass values prior to their dissolution for geochemical analyses, specimens from samples that surround this event were tomographically analyzed to gain insight of the actual microscopic fossils. The analyses showed that the observed increase in the recorded shell weights is the result of both thicker and thus more massive or heavier tests but also partly an artifact due to increased sediment contamination.

Laboratory X-ray micro-computed tomography (μ CT) is a fast-growing method in various scientific research applications including micropaleontology that allows non-destructive imaging of fossils [5]. Virtual micropaleontology through μ CT analysis can give valuable information about seawater carbonate chemistry [6], the preservation state of fossil foraminifera specimens [7,8], changes in the morphology [9] and the thickness of foraminifera shells [10-12], while its combination with shell geochemical measurements is a powerful tool in the study of foraminifera shell biomineralization [13,14]. Despite the multiple use of CT microscopy in foraminifera or paleoceanographic studies and its potential to archive specimens that are frequently destroyed for geochemical analyses, there is only limited availability of raw data for reanalysis.

The present data set consists of tropical foraminifera samples that record a weight anomaly during the penultimate deglaciation period. Due to the direct impact of foraminifera shell building intensities on the alkalinity of the ocean and its atmospheric CO₂ exchanges it is important to closely examine their shell mass and keep a record until their role is better understood. Since weighing and CT scanning are non-destructive analytical techniques they are ideal to precede any destructive paleoceanographic analysis. The CT analysis focused mainly on the biometric characteristics of the specimens that underwent geochemical analysis. However, although the actual specimens have been dissolved, their virtual models together with the original acquisition data are provided here readily available for future use.

Materials and Methods

The specimens used in the present analysis are from core GeoB850-2 (19°13.27'N, 18°56.04'W), which was retrieved from a depth of 2,956 m approximately 250 km offshore the Mauritanian coast. The core samples were initially wet sieved and the coarse fraction (<63 μ m) was subsequently separated in different sieve fractions. The analyzed specimens were picked from the 300-355 μ m size fraction and after scanning they were dissolved for geochemical analyses. Samples from GeoB cores can be obtained from MARUM GeoB Core Repository. Additional information about the study area, the material and the methods used for the present analyses can be found in the accompanying paper [4]. Nano-CT scanning was conducted with a Zeiss Versa 520 at the X-ray Microscopy (XRM) facility of the Natural History Museum, London. Samples were analyzed in batches of nine shells using a customised sample container. The container was made using a crystal clear quartz capillary cylinder piece of 2 cm height and 1 mm inner diameter blocked in one end with a 1 mm glass rod. The glass rod was forced into the quartz cylinder until approximately 1 mm from its open end, creating a space of ≈ 0.8 mm³ for the microfossils (Figure 1). The cylindrical piece was stabilized around the glass rod with nail varnish and the rod was inserted in the sample mounting pin vise. The foraminifera specimens were subsequently transferred into the

container with a saddle brush together with a calcite microcrystal as standard and were stabilized with a drop of tragacanth gum. The samples were left to dry before loaded into the scanner for analysis.

Figure 1: Self-made sample container for foraminifera X-ray computer tomography analysis.

The specimens were picked from the 300-355 μm size fraction and were analyzed at a magnification of 4X by acquiring 1601 projections. Sample mount, X-ray source and detector geometry were kept constant throughout the scans. For optimum foraminifera shell acquisition the voltage was set to 100 kV, the current at 90 μA , providing an overall power of 9 W, and the exposure time was set to 2 sec. A scan resolution voxel size of $\sim 1.2 \mu\text{m}^3$ was typically achieved using this set up. The exact voxel of each scan, as provided by the instrument, is given in the text file that accompanies each data set and it is the one used for segmentation.

Image segmentation followed by a surface determination function was performed using Avizo® software without applying any de-noising filter. The watershed algorithm was mainly used, which automatically separates adjacent areas on a grayscale image into different “materials” based on user-defined attributes of certain pixels. The segmented areas involve the shell area, the sediment contaminated area (dirt area) and the total internal void area (protoplasm area). Initially the test, the dirt and the background areas were defined, where as background marked were the pixels that did not refer to the two previous attributes (shell, dirt). Subsequently the background “material” was deleted and the internal void area

of the shell was manually segmented as “protoplasm” area. The three different areas were then added together to produce the “cell” area, which is the total area occupied by the foraminifer (Figure 2 in [4]).

Data

The data presented here in detail accompany a recent paper [4], where they are summarized and discussed further. The analysis of the high resolution CT scan images of the foraminifera specimens lead to accurate determination of their cell volumes, which were combined with their weighed masses and allowed for the first time the report of volume normalized test weights (or shell densities). The CT data is provided in the form of 16 bit TIFF image stacks with associated voxel size and other scan settings in the accompanying text file. The virtual specimens together with the different spatial information that resulted from the analyses of the tomographs are given in Tables 1 to 3 below. The processed 3D volumes of each specimen created using the surface determination function are also provided with the scan data set in HMASCII file format. The 3D volumes can be viewed with any 3D model viewer, while the two datasets can be combined in CT image analysis software (Figure 2). Interactive views of the 3D models available in the Sketchfab repository are also embedded in the tables below, enabling the virtual specimens to be interactively explored.

Figure 2: Example tomograph of scan GeoB 8502-2_Depth825 in which the HMASCII 3D volume of a processed shell is superimposed.

Table 1: Measurements based on the segmentation of specimens a sample at 785 cm below sea floor of core GeoB 8502-2 corresponding to 122.5 Kyr before present. Shell volume is the volume of shell calcite mass, shell area is the outer surface area of the calcite mass. The ratio of shell volume/shell area (or “specific surface area” [6]) is a measure of average shell thickness. Total cell volume is the sum of shell and internal void (protoplasm) volumes, and dirt % is the percentage of the volume segmented as contamination within the total cell volume.

Sample 785 cm	Shell Volume (μm^3)	Shell Area (μm^2)	Shell thickness (μm)	Cell Volume (μm^3)	Dirt %
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 1	5,319,397	973,457	5.5	20,133,400	7%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 2	5,228,296	1,069,520	4.9	23,128,400	7%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 3	5,014,924	988,223	5.1	20,624,600	3%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 4	5,699,836	1,127,470	5.1	25,106,100	9%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 5	4,867,658	921,172	5.3	18,882,400	2%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 6	5,548,905	1,126,413	4.9	24,397,400	9%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 7	4,542,654	1,030,054	4.4	21,945,300	6%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 8	5,566,874	1,035,128	5.4	22,689,200	1%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth785_Shell 9	4,918,244	1,105,755	4.4	24,028,000	2%
Average	5,189,643 $\pm 7\%$	1,041,910 $\pm 7\%$	5.0 $\pm 7\%$	22,326,089 $\pm 9\%$	5%

Table 2: Measurements based on the segmentation of specimens a sample at 825 cm below sea floor of core GeoB 8502-2 corresponding to 132.2 Kyr before present. Shell volume is the volume of shell calcite mass, shell area is the outer surface area of the calcite mass. The ratio of shell volume/shell area (or “specific surface area” [6]) is a measure of average shell thickness. Total cell volume is the sum of shell and internal void (protoplasm) volumes, and dirt % is the percentage of the volume segmented as contamination within the total cell volume.

Sample 825 cm	Shell Volume (μm^3)	Shell Area (μm^2)	Shell thickness (μm)	Cell Volume (μm^3)	Dirt %
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth825_Shell 1	5,327,092	962,894	5.5	20,825,700	39%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth825_Shell 2	5,916,615	967,372	6.1	20,921,000	8%
GeoB 8502- 2_Depth825_Shell 3	5,375,810	1,055,036	5.1	23,055,000	8%

GeoB 8502-2_Depth825_Shell 4	6,885,647	1,178,105	5.8	27,290,900	9%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth825_Shell 5	6,205,883	1,220,864	5.1	28,907,800	25%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth825_Shell 6	6,233,948	1,000,779	6.2	22,787,800	26%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth825_Shell 7	7,657,985	1,387,413	5.5	34,866,200	21%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth825_Shell 8	5,139,404	964,780	5.3	19,186,100	19%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth825_Shell 9	6,106,162	935,082	6.5	19,301,100	15%
Average	6,094,283 ±14%	1,074,703 ±14%	5.7 ±9%	24,126,844 ±22%	19%

Table 3: Measurements based on the segmentation of specimens a sample at 865 cm below sea floor of core GeoB 8502-2 corresponding to 139.1 Kysr before present. Shell volume is the volume of shell calcite mass, shell area is the outer surface area of the calcite mass. The ratio of shell volume/shell area (or “specific surface area” [6]) is a measure of average shell thickness. Total cell volume is the sum of shell and internal void (protoplasm) volumes, and dirt % is the percentage of the volume segmented as contamination within the total cell volume.

Sample 865 cm	Shell Volume (μm^3)	Shell Area (μm^2)	Shell thickness (μm)	Cell Volume (μm^3)	Dirt %
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 1	4,171,795	926,927	4.5	19,457,800	2%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 2	4,570,961	1,058,658	4.3	23,419,300	1%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 3	3,401,100	654,190	5.2	11,831,500	5%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 4	5,002,276	913,557	5.5	18,774,900	0%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 5	4,173,558	903,174	4.6	18,207,700	5%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 6	4,052,656	947,705	4.3	19,036,800	4%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 7	4,917,115	985,332	5.0	21,232,100	9%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 8	5,439,635	967,690	5.6	21,157,000	6%
GeoB 8502-2_Depth865_Shell 9	3,847,958	910,403	4.2	18,705,500	7%
Average	4,397,450 ±15%	918,626 ±12%	4.8 ±11%	19,091,400 ±17%	4%

Discussion

Acquisition and segmentation of tomographic images is a tedious and time consuming task. To this extend the availability of virtual micropaleontological specimens together with curated CT scan data is an innovative characteristic of the present work. The provided 3D foraminifera shell volumes in HMASCII format retain the segmentation coordinates and can be used together with the TIFF image stack in any CT image analysis software to mask out

the pixel areas that correspond to each specimen. This can be particularly useful for studies that will intent to focus on the gray-scale intensity distribution of the stack images of present data set.

X-ray microscopy and accessible curated CT data in processable forms can offer vast amounts of morphological data on foraminifera fossils and has the potential to promote better (more accurate) species descriptions. The availability of larger databases can advance virtual and distant learning or complement computer-aided species digital identification software [15] in an effort to conduct larger scale morphometric studies of foraminifera that can help to quantify the ecological and evolutionary dynamics of taxa in space and time. Apart from studies that uses CT analysis to examine biometrical foraminifera parameters [9,10,16] there are studies that can use the pixel's grey levels to extract geochemical environmental information [6] or information about the shell's corrosion state [17]. Knowledge of the degree of shell dissolution is of key importance in the study of foraminifera shell mass

CT information is particularly useful in the study of foraminifera shell mass since in order to conclude about the cause behind shell mass changes in the paleoceanographic record it is important to have foraminifera biometric information (cell volumes) and information about the quantity of calcite mass loss to dissolution [13] as well as the degree of contamination due to sediment infilling of chambers, which as shown in the recent study [4] can produce considerable artifact yields.

Conclusions

Micro-CT scanning is proving to be a very useful tool in micropaleontological research and apart from information about fossil specimen morphometry or state of preservation it can be also used to determine and quantify the degree of specimen cleanliness.

Abbreviations

CT: Computed Tomography; Kyr: kilo (thousand) years

Availability of Supporting Data

Supporting data is available in the *GigaScience* GigaDB repository [18] and the Sketchfab specimen 3D models are available in <https://sketchfab.com/GigaDB/collections/microct-images-of-globigerina-bulloides-fossils>.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

SDZ drafted the manuscript. All authors made comments on the manuscript and all authors worked on the data.

References

- 205 1. Schiebel, R. Planktic foraminiferal sedimentation and the marine calcite budget.
206 *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **2002**, 16, 1065,
207 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1029/2001gb001459>.
- 208 2. Barker, S.; Archer, D.; Booth, L.; Elderfield, H.; Henderiks, J.; Rickaby, R.E.M. Globally
209 increased pelagic carbonate production during the Mid-Brunhes dissolution interval
210 and the CO₂ paradox of MIS 11. *Quat Sci Rev.* **2006**, 25, 3278-3293,
211 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quascirev.2006.07.018>.
- 212 3. Zarkogiannis, S.D.; Kontakiotis, G.; Antonarakou, A.; Mortyn, P.G.; Drinia, H.
213 Latitudinal Variation of Planktonic Foraminifera Shell Masses During Termination I.
214 *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* **2019**, 221, 12052,
215 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/221/1/012052>.
- 216 4. Zarkogiannis, S.D.; Antonarakou, A.; Vincent, F.; Kontakiotis, G.; Mortyn, G.P.;
217 Greaves, J.M. Evidence of steady foraminiferal calcification during the Late
218 Quaternary in the Equatorial Atlantic. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*
219 **2020**, submitted.
- 220 5. du Plessis, A.; Broeckhoven, C.; Guelpa, A.; le Roux, S.G. Laboratory X-ray micro-
221 computed tomography: A user guideline for biological samples. *GigaScience* **2017**, 6,
222 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1093/gigascience/gix027>.
- 223 6. Iwasaki, S.; Kimoto, K.; Sasaki, O.; Kano, H.; Uchida, H. Sensitivity of planktic
224 foraminiferal test bulk density to ocean acidification. *Sci. Rep.* **2019**, 9, 9803,
225 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-46041-x>.
- 226 7. Johnstone, H.J.H.; Schulz, M.; Barker, S.; Elderfield, H. Inside story: An X-ray
227 computed tomography method for assessing dissolution in the tests of planktonic
228 foraminifera. *Mar. Micropaleontol.* **2010**, 77, 58-70,
229 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marmicro.2010.07.004>.
- 230 8. Iwasaki, S.; Kimoto, K.; Sasaki, O.; Kano, H.; Honda, M.C.; Okazaki, Y. Observation of
231 the dissolution process of *Globigerina bulloides* tests (planktic foraminifera) by X-ray
232 microcomputed tomography. *Paleoceanography* **2015**, 30, 317-331,
233 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1002/2014PA002639>.
- 234 9. Speijer, R.P.; Van Loo, D.; Masschaele, B.; Vlassenbroeck, J.; Cnudde, V.; Jacobs, P.
235 Quantifying foraminiferal growth with high-resolution X-ray computed tomography:
236 New opportunities in foraminiferal ontogeny, phylogeny, and paleoceanographic
237 applications. *Geosphere* **2008**, 4, 760-763, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1130/ges00176.1>.
- 238 10. Fox, L.; Stukins, S.; Hill, T.; Miller, C.G. Quantifying the Effect of Anthropogenic
239 Climate Change on Calcifying Plankton. *Sci. Rep.* **2020**, 10, 1620,
240 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-58501-w>.
- 241 11. Kontakiotis, G.; Besiou, E.; Antonarakou, A.; Zarkogiannis, S.D.; Kostis, A.; Mortyn,
242 P.G.; Moissette, P.; Cornée, J.J.; Schulbert, C.; Drinia, H., et al. Decoding sea surface
243 and paleoclimate conditions in the eastern Mediterranean over the Tortonian-
244 Messinian Transition. *Palaeogeogr., Palaeoclimatol., Palaeoecol.* **2019**, 534, 109312,
245 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2019.109312>.
- 246 12. Ujiié, Y.; Kimoto, K.; Ishimura, T. Advanced approach to analyzing calcareous protists
247 for present and past pelagic ecology: Comprehensive analysis of 3D-morphology,
248 stable isotopes, and genes of planktic foraminifers. *PLoS One* **2019**, 14, e0213282,
249 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0213282.
- 250 13. Zarkogiannis, S.D.; Antonarakou, A.; Tripathi, A.; Kontakiotis, G.; Mortyn, P.G.; Drinia,
251 H.; Greaves, M. Influence of surface ocean density on planktonic foraminifera
252 calcification. *Sci. Rep.* **2019**, 9, 533, doi:[https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36935-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36935-7)
253 [7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36935-7).
- 254 14. Todd, C.L.; Schmidt, D.N.; Robinson, M.M.; De Schepper, S. Planktic Foraminiferal
255 Test Size and Weight Response to the Late Pliocene Environment. *Paleoceanography*

- 256 *and Paleoclimatology* **2020**, 35, e2019PA003738,
257 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1029/2019PA003738>.
- 258 15. Hsiang, A.Y.; Nelson, K.; Elder, L.E.; Sibert, E.C.; Kahanamoku, S.S.; Burke, J.E.; Kelly,
259 A.; Liu, Y.; Hull, P.M. AutoMorph: Accelerating morphometrics with automated 2D
260 and 3D image processing and shape extraction. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* **2018**, 9, 605-
261 612, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12915>.
- 262 16. Gooday, A.J.; Sykes, D.; Góral, T.; Zubkov, M.V.; Glover, A.G. Micro-CT 3D imaging
263 reveals the internal structure of three abyssal xenophyophore species (Protista,
264 Foraminifera) from the eastern equatorial Pacific Ocean. *Sci. Rep.* **2018**, 8, 12103,
265 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-30186-2>.
- 266 17. Iwasaki, S.; Kimoto, K.; Okazaki, Y.; Ikehara, M. Micro-CT Scanning of Tests of Three
267 Planktic Foraminiferal Species to Clarify Dissolution Process and Progress. *Geochem.*
268 *Geophys. Geosyst.* **2019**, 20, 6051-6065,
269 doi:<https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GC008456>.
- 270 18. Zarkogiannis, S.; Fernandez, V.; Greaves, M.; Mortyn, P.G.; Kontakiotis, G.;
271 Antonarakou, A. Supporting data for "X-ray tomographic data of planktonic
272 foraminifera species Globigerina bulloides from the Eastern Tropical Atlantic across
273 Termination II". GigaScience Database, 2020; <http://dx.doi.org/10.5524/100786>.