

## ***Interactive comment on “Seasonal variations of air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in the largest tropical marginal sea (South China Sea) based on multiple-year underway measurements” by W.-D. Zhai et al.***

**W. Evans (Referee)**

wiley.evans@alaska.edu

Received and published: 13 June 2013

Reviewer: Wiley Evans, Ocean Acidification Research Center/University of Alaska Fairbanks

General Comment:

Zhai et al present an analysis of underway pCO<sub>2</sub> measurements for the South China Sea (SCS) collected during 14 cruises over a 5-year period. This effort builds on some of the authors' previous work within sub-regions of the SCS, however, provides new information by incorporating more data and taking a holistic approach to studying the SCS. It is specifically interesting how the authors sub-divided the SCS into 4 physical-

C2726

biogeochemical domains for the analysis of variability in the fluxes. The manuscript describes important sources of variability in surface water pCO<sub>2</sub> and sea-air CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes within each domain, with a final revised estimate of sea-air CO<sub>2</sub> exchange for the SCS. The methods are sound and generally well described, and the paper is well written. This contribution clearly fits within the scope of Biogeosciences, and should be published following discussion over some points I have laid out below. Best of luck.

Specific Comments:

My most significant comment is that there are many data points shown in Figure 2 that do not fall in any of the specified domains. This is particularly the case for data shown in panels a, b, d, e, and h of that figure. Many of these measurements are adjacent to the coast, with some data from areas with very high surface seawater pCO<sub>2</sub>. Is there a justification for leaving these data out of the analysis? The domains were introduced in the 3rd paragraph of the introduction (page 7034), and the physical-biogeochemical reasoning for selecting the 4 domains makes good sense. This was expanded on in the 3rd paragraph of the Study area section (page 7036). However it is not clear how the exact dimensions of the domains were determined. If Domain A was extended to the coastline, Domain B was extended west to Hainan Island, Domain C was extended south and west, and Domain D extended south, all the data shown in the Figure would be within a domain. In addition, extending Domain A to the coastline would include the high near shore pCO<sub>2</sub> data and perhaps affect the final estimates presented in the paper given that Domain A was determined to be nearly in equilibrium with the atmosphere. I think it needs to be more clearly defined in the text how the borders of each domain were chosen such that some data were excluded.

Discussion/Concluding Remarks sections: Perhaps there should be some comparison with the estimates from the earlier studies that were based on more temporally or spatially limited data (i.e. Zhai et al., 2005)? How does the new holistic estimate from the SCS differ from that reported by the previous spatially limited study, and improve our understanding of the SCS? Some of these points are mentioned in the Introduction,

C2727

but could be moved to the Discussion section.

Concluding Remarks: Last paragraph: rather than, or in addition to, making the comparison to efflux from the equatorial belt of the global ocean, perhaps the SCS flux should be compared to the sink term for the global coastal ocean cited in the first paragraph of the introduction? The newest estimate of coastal ocean sea-air CO<sub>2</sub> exchange by Dai et al., 2013 uses the value for the SCS reported by Zhai et al., 2005. How would using the new SCS value adjust the coastal ocean sink term, if at all? I very much like the last paragraph of the introduction, and feel that these points could be expanded a bit in the Discussion or Concluding Remarks sections.

The terms “air-sea” and “sea-air” are both used throughout the manuscript. I would suggest sticking to “sea-air” because this is the term used in Tables 3-6 and in Figure 6.

Technical Corrections:

Abstract Line 18: sources of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>?

Abstract Line 23: to the atmosphere?

Introduction Page 7033 Line 23: remove the word “such”?

Introduction Page 7034 Line 2: replace “observable” with observed?

Introduction Page 7034 Line 24: replace “variabilities of” with variability in?

Introduction Page 7036 Line 6: pCO<sub>2</sub> defined here but previously introduced on Page 7034 Line 25.

Introduction Page 7036 Line 7: perhaps just cite the range instead of the exponential?

Introduction Page 7036 Line 21: See comment above about defining the domains. Expanding them to include the other data not represented in the domain would increase the percent of total SCS area.

C2728

Methods 3.1: The practical salinity scale is a conductivity ratio and therefore unit-less. PSU is not a unit.

Figure 2 is first introduced on page 7042, after Figures 3, 4 and 5 are introduced. Perhaps Figure 2 should be renamed Figure 5, and the other Figures moved up?

Results 4.4 Page 7042 Lines 4 and 5: Perhaps this should read “increased along with decreasing latitude”?

Results 4.4 Page 7042 Line 20: Perhaps this should read “along with decreasing latitude”?

Results 4.4 Page 7043 Lines 17 to 28: the word “relatively” is repeated 6 times throughout these lines. Maybe use a different word or say explicitly what the value is relative to?

Results 4.5 Page 7044 Lines 9 and 10: Should the other studies be referenced? Where are these comparisons in the manuscript?

Results 4.5 Page 7044 Line 15: remove “variation in”.

Results 4.5 Page 7044 Line 16: Should this read “seen on the . . .”?

Results 4.5 Page 7044 Lines 22 to 24: Error and uncertainty is not the same thing. Using variation synonymously with uncertainty is also a bit confusing.

Results 4.5 Page 7045 Lines 13 to 18: Perhaps add each annual value to the table legend for each respective domain?

Discussion 5.1 Page 7049 Line 14: replace “driven” with “that drove”?

Discussion 5.2 Page 7050 Line 3: insert the between “of above-”.

Discussion 5.2 Page 7050 Line 3: I'm not sure climatological is the correct word here. Perhaps “typical” would be better? In general, the point made in this paragraph is very interesting.

C2729

Concluding Remarks: Perhaps shift the last paragraph up to precede the first paragraph?

Concluding Remarks: The statement on Lines 11 through 15 is a bit anticlimactic.

Tables 3 to 6: Is the seasonal average flux the mean of survey fluxes calculated using the W92 or S07 relation? This isn't clear in the text which relation is used, only that both are used so that values can be compared to other studies. Perhaps add the annual mean estimate for the respective domain to the legend?

Figure 1: Stars are hard to see, especially the SEATS location star. Perhaps shade darker?

Figures 7-10: perhaps make marker edge colors the same as the marker face colors? This may make some of the markers easier to see.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 7031, 2013.