

Interactive comment on “Annual CO₂ budget and seasonal CO₂ exchange signals at a High Arctic permafrost site on Spitsbergen, Svalbard archipelago” by J. Lüers et al.

F. J. W. Parmentier

frans-jan.parmenier@nateko.lu.se

Received and published: 20 March 2014

The manuscript by J. Lüers et al. represents a very interesting dataset which is certainly of interest to the wider flux measuring community. However, while reading it, I noticed something apart from the issues already raised by the reviewer (such as the Burba correction), which may be worth mentioning, too.

In the text, a CO₂ release from the snowpack is described following the passage of air depleted in CO₂. The measured flux is subsequently ascribed to this drop in CO₂. However, the presented concentrations are expressed in mmol/m³, and not in ppm, while temperature and pressure changes will lead to significant differences between

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

concentrations in ppm and mmol/m³. This is especially true because a large change in temperature and pressure occurred at the same time the values in mmol/m³ changed.

As an example, I therefore extracted two datapoints from Figure 3, at the 15th of March and the 17th of March, both at 3 'o clock at night. Over that period, a large drop in CO₂ occurred as well as a large change in air pressure and temperature. Once the concentrations in mmol/m³ were converted to ppm, a CO₂ concentration of 368.5 ppm is derived in both cases.

There is some uncertainty in these numbers (since I had to read them from the figure), but it looks like there is no large change in concentration over this period, which negates the notion that the efflux of CO₂ was caused by the passage of air depleted in CO₂.

Then again, the paper rightfully points towards pressure effects, which may be more relevant than the CO₂ concentration. Pressure changes would stimulate efflux in and out of the snowpack, and it seems this represents a more classic storage problem, where there's a disconnect between the source and the measurement height. The underlying cause for the observed fluxes may therefore be sought in that direction instead.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 1535, 2014.

BGD

11, C476–C477, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

