Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 2161–2212, 2015 www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/12/2161/2015/ doi:10.5194/bgd-12-2161-2015 © Author(s) 2015. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Biogeosciences (BG). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in BG if available.

# Seasonal and inter-annual variability in wetland methane emissions simulated by CLM4Me' and CAM-chem and comparisons to observations of concentrations

L. Meng<sup>1</sup>, R. Paudel<sup>2</sup>, P. G. M. Hess<sup>2</sup>, and N. M. Mahowald<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Geography and Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14850, USA <sup>3</sup>Department of Biological and Environmental Engineering, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14850, USA

Received: 11 December 2014 - Accepted: 15 January 2015 - Published: 2 February 2015

Correspondence to: L. Meng (lei.meng@wmich.edu)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.



#### Abstract

Understanding the temporal and spatial variation of wetland methane emissions is essential to the estimation of the global methane budget. We examine the seasonal and inter-annual variability in wetland methane emissions simulated in the Community Land Model (CLM4Me'). Methane emissions from both the Carbon-Nitrogen (CN,

- i.e. CLM4.0) and the Biogeochemistry (BGC, i.e. CLM4.5) versions of the CLM are evaluated. We further conduct simulations of the transport and removal of methane using the Community Atmosphere Model (CAM-chem) model using CLM4Me' methane emissions from both CN and BGC along with other methane sources and compare
- <sup>10</sup> model simulated atmospheric methane concentration with observations. In addition, we simulate the atmospheric concentrations based on the TransCom wetland and rice paddy emissions from a different terrestrial ecosystem model VISIT. Our analysis suggests CN wetland methane emissions are higher in tropics and lower in high latitudes than BGC. In CN, methane emissions decrease from 1993 to 2004 while this trend
- does not appear in the BGC version. In the CN versions, methane emission variations follow satellite-derived inundation wetlands closely. However, they are dissimilar in BGC due to its different carbon cycle. CAM-chem model simulations with CLM4Me' methane emissions suggest that both prescribed anthropogenic and predicted wetlands methane emissions contribute substantially to seasonal and inter-annual variabil-
- ity in atmospheric methane concentration. It also suggests that different spatial patterns of wetland emissions can have significant impacts on N–S atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentration gradients and growth rates. This study suggests that large uncertainties still exist in terms of spatial patterns and magnitude of global wetland methane budgets, and that substantial uncertainty comes from the carbon model underlying the methane flux modules.



#### 1 Introduction

The increase in atmospheric methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) concentration since 2007 (Rigby et al., 2008) has received attention due to methane's strong greenhouse effect. The causes of the renewed increase in CH<sub>4</sub> since 2007 and the relative stability of the atmospheric concentrations for the preceding decade (1996–2006) are not well understood (Bloom et al., 2010). Improved understanding of the variability of atmospheric methane can provide more accurate predictions of future concentrations. Changes in atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> are determined by the balance between the emissions of CH<sub>4</sub> and its loss. The loss is mostly controlled by the reaction of CH<sub>4</sub> with the hydroxyl radical (OH). While
the CH<sub>4</sub> loss timescale varies from year to year (Bousquet et al., 2006; Wuebbles and Hayhoe, 2002) as the OH concentration changes, recent evidence suggests the interannual variability of OH is small (Montzka et al., 2011). The primary sources of atmospheric methane include anthropogenic emissions, natural wetlands, rice paddies, biomass burning, and termites (Denman et al., 2007; Kirschke et al., 2013). Natural

- wetlands are the largest single source of atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> and make a significant contribution to its variability (Spahni et al., 2011). Using inverse methods Bousquet et al. (2006) suggests that 70 % of the global emission anomalies CH<sub>4</sub> for the period 1984–2003 are due to the inter-annual variability in wetland emissions and furthermore that tropical methane emissions are the dominant contribution to the global inter-annual variability. In another methane inversion, Chen and Prinn (2006) find that the large 1998 increase in atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentration could be attributed to global wetland
- 1998 increase in atmospheric  $CH_4$  concentration could be attributed to global wetland emissions.

There are still large uncertainties in global wetland emissions due to (1) poor understanding of environmental and biological processes that control methane emissions

(Meng et al., 2012; Riley et al., 2011); and (2) uncertainties in extent and distribution of wetlands, particularly in tropical region (Prigent et al., 2007; Spahni et al., 2011). Process-based biogeochemical methane models can help improve the understanding of dominant processes that control methane production, oxidation, and transport.



Several process-based models that incorporate different environmental and biological processes have been developed. For instance, Wania et al. (2009) develop the Wetland Hydrology and Methane (LPJ-WhyMe) model to simulate peatland hydrology and methane emissions from northern latitudes using a mechanistic approach. Recently Spahni et al. (2011) incorporate LPJ-WhyMe into the Lund-Potsdam-Jena dynamic

- global vegetation model (DGVM) to simulate methane emissions on a global scale by dividing global ecosystems into four different types (northern peatland (45–90° N), naturally inundated wetlands (60° S–45° N), rice agriculture and wet mineral soils) and using different parameters to characterize the processes relevant for methane pro-
- <sup>10</sup> duction, oxidation, and transport in the soil in each of these ecosystems. Zhuang et al. (2004) couple a methane module to a process-based biogeochemistry model, the Terrestrial Ecosystem Model (TEM), and explicitly calculated methane production, oxidation, and transport in the soil. Xu et al. (2010) include a methane module in the Dynamic Land Ecosystem Model (DLEM) to simulate methane production, oxidation,
- <sup>15</sup> and transport (Xu et al., 2010). Riley et al. (2011) integrate a methane biogeochemical model (CLM4Me) into the Community Land Model (CLM), the land component of the Community Climate System Models (Gent et al., 2011) and the Community Earth System Model (CESM). Meng et al. (2012) adde additional features into CLM4Me including an emission dependence on pH and on redox potential. This revised version of
- <sup>20</sup> CLM4Me is referred as CLM4Me' (Meng et al., 2012). Detailed description of CLM4Me and CLM4Me' can be found in Riley et al. (2011) and Meng et al. (2012). The large uncertainties in methane fluxes due to parameter uncertainty in this model are quantified in Riley et al. (2011).

These process-based models are often evaluated against surface CH<sub>4</sub> flux measure-<sup>25</sup> ments based on chamber techniques (Jauhiainen et al., 2005; Keller, 1990; Shannon and White, 1994). However, there are only limited observational datasets available for model evaluation and most of them are in mid- and high latitudes. The shortage of tropical methane measurements makes it difficulty to evaluate the spatial distribution of modeled surface emissions. This is especially critical as the tropical wetlands are the



largest contribution to global wetland methane emissions (Bloom et al., 2010; Meng et al., 2012; Spahni et al., 2011).

The spatial distribution of surface emissions produced by these biogeochemical models can be used along with other CH<sub>4</sub> emission sources as inputs to atmospheric chemistry and transport models to simulate atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentration. As wetland emissions are the largest single source, their spatial distribution could significantly affect the distribution of atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentration. The long-term atmospheric measurement of CH<sub>4</sub> can be used to compare with modeled atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> to further evaluate the spatial distribution of surface emissions. Recently, a chemistrytransport model (CTM) intercomparison experiment (TransCom-CH<sub>4</sub>) quantifies the role of CH<sub>4</sub> surface emission distributions in simulating the global distribution of atmospheric methane (Patra et al., 2011). In TransCom-CH<sub>4</sub>, twelve chemistry-transport models simulations with different surface emissions are evaluated against measured atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentrations. Patra et al. (2011) find that meteorological conditions and surface emissions from biomass burning and wetlands can contribute up to

60% of the inter-annual variation (IAV) in the atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentrations.

In this study, we explore the temporal and spatial variation of wetland methane emissions estimated in the CLM4Me'. The modeled wetland emissions are used with other surface emissions (including emissions from anthropogenic sources, biomass burning,

- rice paddies, and termites) as inputs to the Community Atmospheric Model with chemistry (CAM-chem). The CH<sub>4</sub> concentration simulated with CAM-chem is compared with a global network of station measurements. The purposes of this paper are (1) to examine seasonal and interannual variations in wetland methane emissions simulated by CLM4Me' in different versions of the Community Land Model; (2) to evaluate the
- relative importance of different surface emissions distributions of methane on the seasonal and inter-annual variations in atmospheric concentrations. Section 2 describes models, methods and datasets. Results and discussions are presented in Sect. 3. We conclude in Sect. 4 with a summary of major findings.



#### 2 Models and datasets

#### 2.1 Simulations

5

Methane emissions from 1993–2004 are simulated and analyzed in four different model configurations (see Table 1). All configurations use Community Atmospheric Model (CAM4) with chemistry (CAM-chem) (Lamarque et al., 2012) to diagnose atmospheric methane. These configurations differ in their specification of methane emissions. Other details of the simulations are identical.

The TransCom simulation (Table 1) is reported on as part of the TransCom-CH<sub>4</sub> simulations (Patra et al., 2011). The CAM-chem model is one of the twelve models participating in these simulations (Patra et al., 2011). The methane emissions in the TransCom are specified and included the seasonal variation of methane emissions from anthropogenic sources (Olivier and Berdowski, 2001), rice paddies and wetlands (Ito and Inatomi, 2012), biomass burning (van der Werf et al., 2006), and termites Fung et al., 1991). The wetland emissions from Ito and Inatomi (2012) are calculated based

- on a process-based terrestrial ecosystem model, the Vegetation Integrative Simulator for Trace gases (VISIT). In the VISIT, the inundated area is calculated based on modelderived rainfall and temperature (Mitchell and Jones, 2005). We selecte this scenario from the TransCom experiment because it includes the long-term monthly variations of wetland and rice paddy emissions.
- Differences between the TransCom simulation and the other three simulations analyzed here (see Table 1) include: (1) differences in the specification of the methane emissions from rice paddies and wetlands: in the TransCom simulation the emissions are specified while in the remaining three simulations the methane emissions are obtained from CLM4Me' a process-based methane biogeochemical model; (2) dif-
- ferences in the specification of fire emissions: in the TransCom simulation fire emissions are taken from Global Fire Emission Database (GFED) version 2 (on average  $20 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  is emitted) (van der Werf et al., 2006) while in the remaining three sim-



ulations the fire emissions are from GFED version 3 (on average 21.1 Tg  $CH_4$  yr<sup>-1</sup> emitted) (Giglio et al., 2010).

Two of the configurations analyzed (labeled: CN\_a and CN\_b) diagnose wetlands and rice paddies methane emissions using CLM4Me' within the Community Land Model version 4 (CLM4 or CLM-CN) of the Community Earth System Model (CESM); one configuration (labeled BGC) uses CLM4Me' within the Community Land Model

version 4.5 (CLM4.5 or CLM-BGC) of the CESM.

The wetland emissions simulated by the CLM4Me<sup>'</sup> model when integrated in the CLM4.0 are on the high side of the current estimates (Denman et al., 2007; Kirschke et

- <sup>10</sup> al., 2013). In order to obtain a reasonable overall methane budget we adjust the emissions in the simulations using CLM4.0. In simulation CN\_a the anthropogenic emissions used in the TransCom simulations are multiplied by 0.72; in simulation CN\_b the wetland emissions are multiplied by 0.64, but the anthropogenic emissions are the same as those in TransCom. Both these rescalings retain the temporal and spatial
- <sup>15</sup> emission distributions from the original datasets but simulate the approximately correct atmospheric methane concentrations. In the first case (CN\_a), where anthropogenic emissions are reduced, the total anthropogenic emissions are 217 Tg yr<sup>-1</sup>. This is at the low end of estimated anthropogenic emissions, but within the range (209–273 Tg) report of values in the literature (see IPCC AR4 Chapter 7) (Denman et al., 2007;
   <sup>20</sup> Kirschke et al., 2013) when excluding biomass burning and rice paddies.

On the other hand the wetland emissions simulated by the CLM4Me' model integrated into CLM4.5 (BGC) are higher than the CLM4.0 (CN) emissions. Therefore, we adjuste the wetland emissions in the BGC simulation. In particular in the BGC simulation the wetland emissions are reduced by 0.74 to match the total methane emissions

<sup>25</sup> in the other simulations. Reducing the methane emissions is equivalent to modifying the coefficient for the maximum amount of methane that can be produced from heterotrophic respiration. The reductions used here are within the uncertainties of this estimate (e.g. Riley et al., 2013). The same termite emissions are used in all simula-



tions. The global interannual average of methane emissions used in CN\_a, CN\_b and BGC are similar to that used in TransCom.

# 2.2 CLM4Me'

CLM4Me' (Meng et al., 2012) is a process-based methane biogeochemical models incorporated in the CLM version 4 and CLM version 4.5 of the Community Earth System Model (CESM). CLM4Me' is based on CLM4Me (Riley et al., 2011) and explicitly calculates methane production, methane oxidation, methane ebullition, methane diffusion through soils, and methane transport through aerenchyma. CLM4Me' is an update of CLM4Me to include a pH and redox functional dependence for methane emissions, and

- a limitation of aerenchyma in plants in always-inundated areas (Meng et al., 2012). A detailed description of CLM4Me and CLM4Me' can be found in Meng et al. (2012) and Riley et al. (2011). In this study, CLM4Me' is forced with multi-satellite derived inundation fraction (Prigent et al., 2007) and NCEP (i.e., the National Center for Environmental Prediction) reanalysis datasets (Kistler et al., 2001; Qian et al., 2006). Model spin-up is clearchied in Meng et al. (2012).
- <sup>15</sup> is described in Meng et al. (2012). While the simulation period is 1990–2005 satellite inundation data is only available from 1993–2004. We use climatological monthly average (1993–2004) inundation fraction for years 1990–1992 and 2005.

# 2.3 Community land model (CLM)

The CLM4Me' is integrated and spun up in two versions of the CLM: CLM4.0 and
 <sup>20</sup> CLM4.5. The CLM4.0 uses the carbon and nitrogen below ground module from the Carbon-Nitrogen (CN) model (Thornton et al., 2007, 2009). The CLM4.5 is updated from the CLM4.0 and offers some improvements with the most significant change to the below ground carbon cycle (Koven et al., 2013). The CLM4.5 includes an alternate decomposition cascade from the Century soil model, which is referred to as the
 <sup>25</sup> biogeochemistry version of the model (CLM4.5-BGC). This version of the model has increased productivity and carbon in high latitudes (perhaps an overestimate) and re-



duced productivity in the tropics compared to the CN model (see Koven et al., 2013 for more comparisons). The initial condition in the both CLM models is created using NCEP-reanalysis datasets in two steps. First the model is brought close to equilibrium for 1850 surface conditions (atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration, aerosol deposition, nitrogen deposition, and land use change); however, a 25 year (1948–1972) subset of transient climate data (1948–2004) is repeatedly cycles. Then we use these equilibrated conditions in a transient simulation for the transient climate data (1948–2004).

librated conditions in a transient simulation from 1850 to 1990 to produce the initial condition used in this study.

# 2.4 The CAM-chem model

We use the CAM-chem (CAM-chem) (Lamarque et al., 2012) driven by the NCEP reanalysis dataset (Kistler et al., 2001; Qian et al., 2006) to predict the atmospheric concentrations of methane. In CAM-chem, the chemistry is fully integrated in CAM4. In this study, we conducte simulations with CAM-chem using offline meteorological forcing, similar to the model set up used in TransCom (Patra et al., 2011). The simulations are performed at a horizontal resolution of 1.9° (latitude) and 2.5° (longitude) and at 28 vertical layers. Please refer to Lamarque et al. (2012) for a detailed description of CAM-chem.

In the CAM-chem model used here, the atmospheric chemistry is simplified compared to Lamarque et al. (2012), and includes only the reactions necessary to capture

- <sup>20</sup> the loss of methane. The simulations include the chemical removal reactions for  $CH_4$ , reactions with OH, the excited atomic oxygen O<sup>1</sup>D, and chlorine (Cl). Specifics of the chemical loss reactions can be found in Patra et al. (2011). Interannually constant monthly mean OH is used in the CAM-chem simulations. The optimized OH derived from  $CH_3CCl_3$  concentrations scaled from Spivakovsky et al. (2000) is used where an
- equal OH abundance is assumed in both the Northern and Southern Hemispheres. The distribution of OH used to compute the loss of atmospheric methane is identical to that used in TransCom experiments. Stratospheric loss due to Chlorine (CI) and O<sup>1</sup>D is also included. Interannually constant monthly CI and O<sup>1</sup>D are used in the simula-



tions. In addition a soil sink for  $CH_4$  is included using a climatological monthly average derived from LMDZ atmospheric  $CH_4$  inversion (Bousquet et al., 2006).

Atmospheric concentrations of methane are tagged from the rice paddy, wetland, anthropogenic and biomass burning emission sources. The losses of tagged methane are identical to those described above.

#### 2.5 Observed atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentration

Observational atmospheric  $CH_4$  concentration datasets are obtained from the World Data Centre for Greenhouse Gases (WDCGG) at http://ds.data.jma.go.jp/gmd/wdcgg/. Monthly concentration datasets from 14 stations (Table 2) around the world are compared with the simulated atmospheric  $CH_4$  (Butler et al., 2004; Cunnold et al., 2002). Most of the sites have monthly or weekly measurements and use flask-sampling method. Collected samples are analyzed using gas chromatography with flame ionization detection (Dlugokencky et al., 2005).

# 2.6 RMS variability

- <sup>15</sup> Seasonal and inter-annual Root Mean Square (RMS) variability are used to evaluate the spatial distribution of simulated methane variability. We apply the method described in Nevison et al. (2008). Here, seasonal RMS variability is calculated as the RMS of the differences between model climatological monthly means (1990–2004) and the climatological annual mean. The interannual variability of RMS is calculated as the RMS
- <sup>20</sup> of the differences between each month and the corresponding month from the climatological seasonal cycle. We calculate RMS separately for methane tagged from each tagged emission source. This apportions the variability of each source by calculating the ratio between the variability due to that source RMS and the total RMS. Please note that the sum of individual source's contribution to total RMS is often greater than
- <sup>25</sup> 1 in cases of cancelation of signals among individual sources.



#### 2.7 Taylor diagrams

Taylor diagrams can provide a concise statistical summary of model performance in a single polar coordinate plot (Taylor, 2001). In this study, we use Taylor diagrams to evaluate the model's ability to simulate the observed inter-annual variability (IAV)

of atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub>. The Taylor diagram gives the model-measurement coefficient R reflecting the agreement in shape and phasing of the two time series and the ratio of modeled to measured standard deviation  $\sigma_{model}/\sigma_{obs}$ , which represents the agreement between the amplitude of the simulated and observed inter-annual variability (IAV) of atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub>

#### 10 3 Results and discussions

15

#### 3.1 Comparison of methane fluxes in different sources

A comparison of methane fluxes used in the four experiments shows that wetlands and rice paddies methane emissions in CN\_a are higher than those used in other three simulations (Fig. 1). Emissions from wetlands and rice paddies in the CN\_b simulation (i.e., the CN\_a wetland emissions reduced by 36%) simulations are comparable with those used in TransCom and BGC experiments (Fig. 1). There are different magnitudes

- in the seasonal and inter-annual variations among these four experiments. Overall, BGC has the lowest winter emissions. There is a decreasing trend in the CN\_a and CN\_b methane emissions not evident in the TransCom and BGC methane emissions.
- The difference in methane emissions in CN\_a, CN\_b, and BGC experiments will be discussed in the next session. The fire emissions in the TransCom simulation (based on GFED v2) and the other simulations (based on GFED v3) (Fig. 2) are similar in magnitude, but with some distinct seasonal differences.

Overall, the anthropogenic methane emissions tend to stabilize after 1998, due to <sup>25</sup> the decrease from mid- and high latitudes (Fig. 3). The annual total methane emis-



sions used in CN\_a and CN\_b experiments are slightly higher (lower) than that used in TransCom experiment during the first (second) half of the study period (Fig. 4). The annual total emissions used in BGC are slightly lower than those used in TransCom during most years except 1997, 1998, and 2002. There are no statistically significant trends (at ~ 95 % level) in the difference between the BGC and TransCom total emissions.

#### 3.2 Seasonal and inter-annual variability in CN\_a and BGC methane emissions

#### 3.2.1 CN\_a methane emissions

There are strong seasonal and inter-annual variations in CN\_a wetland methane emissions (Fig. 5). On a seasonal basis, the peak methane emissions occur in the summer and the lowest methane emissions occur in winter as methane emission is controlled by both temperatures and inundated area. On an inter-annual basis, the summer of 1994 has the highest methane fluxes in the period of 1993–2004 in CN\_a methane emissions. A generally decreasing trend ( $-2.1 \text{ Tg CH}_4 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ , significant at 95 % level) in CN\_a slabel wetland emissions ensure fluxes in the period of the summer of

- <sup>15</sup> in CN\_a global wetland emissions occur from 1994 to 2004 driven by trends in tropical wetland emissions (Fig. 5) as tropical wetlands contribute to ~78% of the global wetland flux. The decreasing rate in tropical wetland emissions from 1993–2004 is approximately –1.68 Tg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>, statistically significantly different from 0 (no change) at the 95% confidence level.
- We further identify the four highest (1994, 1995, 1996, 1999) and lowest (2001, 2002, 2003, 2004) annual CN\_a methane emissions in the period of 1993–2004 and plot the difference in spatial distribution of methane emissions between the average of the 4 extreme high and low emission years (Fig. 6a). There are large increases across much of the globe, but the largest difference occurs in the tropics (see the latitudinal average on the left). This is not surprising given the tropical regions contribute to approximately
- <sup>25</sup> on the left). This is not surprising given the tropical regions contribute to approximately 78% of the global wetland flux in this model configuration. At regional level, the largest



differences are primarily present in Indonesia and South America (e.g., Amazon regions).

#### 3.2.2 BGC methane emissions

The trend in BGC wetland methane emissions is different from that in CN\_a experiment (Fig. 5). In the BGC simulation, the peak emissions occur in 2002 instead of 1994. The wetland emissions do not decrease significantly from 1993 to 2004 with no significant trends in the inter-annual methane emissions in the mid- and high- latitudes and the tropics in these simulations. There are several additional differences between CN\_a and BGC wetland emissions: (1) BGC wetland emissions are approximately 10 % lower than CN\_a wetland emissions; (2) BGC estimates the tropical (-30° S-20° N) wetland emissions to be 63 Tg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>, approximately 60 % lower than those in CN\_a (158 Tg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>); (3) high latitudes (>50° N) wetland emissions in BGC are 97 Tg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup> while CN\_a only produces 12 Tg CH<sub>4</sub> yr<sup>-1</sup>. Such large differences are probably largely due to the shift of carbon from tropics to high latitudes as a result of the modifications from CN\_a to BGC (i.e., the multi-level biogeochemistry) (Koven et al., 2013). BGC and CN\_a produce similar methane emissions in the mid-latitudes (20–50° N).

The latitudinal distribution of the methane emissions in CN\_a suggests the largest seasonal variation occurs at approximately 20–30° N, followed by the latitudinal band  $50-60^{\circ}$  N (Fig. 7a). High latitudes (> 65° N) have no clear seasonal cycles due to the low methane fluxes that CN\_a produces in the high latitudes (Meng et al., 2012). There is a very dampened seasonal variation of CH<sub>4</sub> emissions in tropical wetlands (10° S–10° N), although tropical wetlands are the largest contribution to total wetland emissions. The seasonal cycle shown in Fig. 7a in different latitudinal bands is consistent with that identified in Spahni et al. (2011) (see their Fig. 4a).

The latitudinal distribution of methane emissions shows a strong seasonal variation in high latitudes in BGC. As clearly shown in Fig. 7b, peak methane emis-



sions (> 200 mg CH<sub>4</sub> m<sup>-2</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>) occur in summer seasons and low methane emissions (~ 10 mg CH<sub>4</sub> m<sup>-2</sup> day<sup>-1</sup>) are present in winter. The maximum emissions occur at approximately 60° N as distinct from the CN\_a simulations.

The peak emissions in BGC from 1993–2004 occur in 1998 followed by 2002, 1994, and 2003. The four lowest emission years are 1999, 2000, 2001, and 1996. As shown in Fig. 6b, the increase in methane emissions between the four lowest to highest years is primarily on the equator, in the Southern Hemisphere (around 30° S) and in the high latitudes (50–70° N). This is distinct from the CN\_a simulations where the largest change predominantly occurs in the tropics (Fig. 6a).

# <sup>10</sup> 3.3 Contribution of individual sources to seasonal and inter-annual variability in atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub>

In order to determine the relative contribution of each source to total atmospheric  $CH_4$  variability as simulated in CAM-chem model, we calculate the seasonal and interannual Root Mean Square (RMS) variability for the total  $CH_4$  concentration and the partial contribution of the anthropogenic source, rice paddies, and wetlands to the overall RMS (Figs. 8 and 9). These three sources have the largest contribution to the annual RMS due to their large magnitudes.

#### 3.3.1 Seasonal and inter-annual variability in CN\_a methane emissions

Seasonal variability of atmospheric methane concentration is high in the tropics and Southern Hemisphere and low in the northern high latitudes. The low seasonal variability in the northern high latitudes is consistent with the relatively low magnitude of northern high latitude methane fluxes, plus the fact that the highest emissions occur during the summer, when the vertical mixing is highest.

Inter-annual variability (IAV) in RMS is relatively homogeneous across the globe with slightly higher IAV in the Southern Hemisphere. IAV RMS of atmospheric methane is generally larger than the seasonal RMS. Both anthropogenic sources and wetlands are



the dominant contributors to the seasonal RMS variability in the Northern Hemisphere (Fig. 8), while wetlands are the only dominant contributor to the IAV RMS variability. This is in agreement with Bousquet et al. (2006) that wetland emissions dominate the inter-annual variability of methane sources. Rice paddies play a more important role in seasonal RMS variability than in inter-annual RMS variability over Asia and North America. This is consistent with the largest seasonal variations in rice paddy emissions

America. This is consistent with the largest seasonal variations in rice paddy emissions occur over Asia and North America (Meng et al., 2013). Similar results are also found in CN\_b simulations.

# 3.3.2 Seasonal and inter-annual variability in BGC methane emissions

<sup>10</sup> Compared to CN\_a, the BGC methane emissions show higher seasonal and interannual variability, particularly in high-latitudes (Fig. 9). For instance, Alaska and Siberia are two regions that have the highest variability. For both the seasonal and inter-annual variations, wetlands dominate the variability, followed by anthropogenic sources. Rice paddies only play a role in the tropics (0–30° N). Both wetlands and anthropogenic <sup>15</sup> methane emissions in BGC contribute a higher percentage to the inter-annual variations than in CN\_a simulations.

#### 3.4 Interhemispheric gradients in atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentrations

The latitudinal gradient from TransCom, CN\_a, CN\_b, BGC, and observations is shown in Fig. 10. The latitudinal gradient is defined as the difference in averaged CH<sub>4</sub> concentration between Northern and Southern Hemispheres (N–S gradients) stations listed in Table 2. The N–S gradients produced in all four simulations are highly correlated with observations for the period of 1993–2004 (Fig. 10). The correlations (*r*) are 0.83,0.72, 0.76, 0.91 for TransCom, CN\_a, CN\_b, and BGC, respectively. It is also clearly shown in Fig. 10 that the TransCom and CN\_a simulations underestimate the N–S Hemi-sphere gradients. The underestimation of N–S gradients in CN\_a might be due to the high tropical wetland emissions in this case as the high tropical emissions are likely to



increase the CH<sub>4</sub> concentration in the Southern Hemisphere. The BGC simulation significantly overestimates the N–S Hemisphere gradients, by about 70%, possibly due to the large high latitude methane emissions in this simulation. The CN\_b simulation, with the same anthropogenic emissions as TransCom, but decreased CN\_a methane
emissions best reproduces the observed N–S gradient during the period of 1993–2004. The N–S gradients decrease between 1993 and 2004 in TransCom, CN\_a, and CN\_b experiments, although there is only slight decrease in the measurements (Fig. 10). Dlugokencky et al. (2011) calculate the inter-polar difference (IPD) (difference between northern (53–90° N) and southern (53–90° S) annual mean CH<sub>4</sub> concentration) from the observations and find a slight decrease in IPD from 1993 to 2010.

#### 3.5 Evaluation of model inter-annual variability

Model simulation of the IAV of atmospheric  $CH_4$  concentration is evaluated against site observations over 14 stations (Table 1) around the world. The climatological seasonal cycle is removed in order to focus on the IAV.  $CN_a$  simulates the trend in IAV from 1993

- to approximately 2001 at all of the stations, but tends to underestimate observations during the later period (2001–2004) (Fig. 11). Such an underestimation might be due to the large decrease in CN\_a simulated wetland emissions (Fig. 5). The CN\_b simulation with decreased wetland emissions (CN\_b in Fig. 11) shows increased atmospheric methane concentrations during the later period (2001–2004) allowing for a better match
- <sup>20</sup> between observations and model simulations. In the BGC experiment, model simulated atmospheric concentrations are relatively flat from 1998 to 2004, which matched observations well (Fig. 11). In the TransCom experiment, simulated CH<sub>4</sub> concentration anomalies are generally in good agreements with observations at all of the stations.

The Taylor diagram of model-observation comparisons of interannual variability show

that TransCom performed the best among the three cases while CN\_b and BGC simulations performed slightly better than CN\_a due to a better correlation with the measurements (Fig. 12). The performance of BGC simulations is comparable to (or slightly better than) TransCom in terms of the correlation (Fig. 13) although the model tends to



overpredict the amplitude of the inter-annual variability. Decreasing wetland emissions (CN\_b) allows for a better match between model simulations and observations. This suggests that CN\_a simulations might overestimate wetland emissions, which agrees with the findings in Kirschke et al. (2013).

#### 5 3.6 Methane growth rate

The growth rate refers to the average increase in atmospheric  $CH_4$  concentration per year. We calculate the growth rate at each station from the observations and for each simulation. The observed average growth rate ranges from 3.2 to 4.6 ppb yr<sup>-1</sup> with an average of 4.0 ppb yr<sup>-1</sup> (Fig. 14, Table 3). The average growth rate in TransCom,  $CN_a$ ,  $CN_b$ , and BGC experiments is 4.2, 3.29, 4.05, and 5.68 ppb yr<sup>-1</sup>, respectively (Table 3). The growth rate in TransCom,  $CN_a$ ,  $CN_b$  and BGC simulations has a large range (from -0.48 to 6.44 ppb yr<sup>-1</sup>) at all stations analyzed. As can be seen from

- Fig. 14, both CN\_a and CN\_b tend to underestimate the observed growth rate in Northern Hemisphere, but overestimate it in Southern Hemisphere (Fig. 14) except for the
- South Pole station. BGC tends to overestimate growth rate in the Northern Hemisphere, particularly in the high latitudes (Fig. 14). TransCom gives better agreement with the measured growth rates in the Southern Hemisphere than in the Northern Hemisphere. The largest difference in the growth rate between the three cases and the observations occur at the Zeppelinfjellet (zep, Norway) where the average growth rate in TransCom,
- <sup>20</sup> CN\_a, CN\_b, BGC and observations was -0.92, -0.48, 1.99, 4.2, and 3.4 ppb yr<sup>-1</sup>, respectively (Table 3). The largest difference between BGC and observations is at Barrow, where the growth rate in BGC experiment was approximately 2 times of that in observations. Overall, CN\_a and CN\_b underestimate the station growth rate in high latitudes while BGC overestimates it.
- In addition, a summary of the comparison of model N–S gradients, annual growth rates, and inter-annual variability with observations is presented in Fig. 15. Four stations are specifically selected to represent the South Pole, tropical region, mid-latitudes, and high northern latitudes. Root mean square errors and biases for the four simula-



tions at these four stations are listed in Table 4. As seen in Fig. 15, and discussed above, no one model simulation best matches all the observational metrics.

#### 3.7 Comparison of inter-annual variability between this study and others

We also compare the inter-annual variability in CH<sub>4</sub> emission anomalies in the sim<sup>5</sup> ulations analyzed here with those given in Spahni et al. (2011), in an updated long term atmospheric synthesis inversion from Bousquet et al. (2006) and from Ringeval et al. (2010) (Fig. 16). As discussed above, the CN\_a emissions reach their maximum in 1994 and decrease thereafter from 1994–2004 (Fig. 16). The BGC emissions have the highest emissions in 1998 followed by the lowest emissions in 1999 and increased from 1999 to 2004. The TransCom emissions increase from 1993 to 1998 and slightly decrease since then. The wetland emissions in Ringeval et al. (2010) decrease from 1993–2000. The Ringeval et al. (2010) averaged annual wetland methane emissions are ~ 215 Tg yr<sup>-1</sup>, similar to the CN\_a wetland emissions. However, the atmospheric synthesis inversions of global wetlands (update of Bousquet et al., 2006, constant OH)
<sup>15</sup> wetland emissions increase from 1990 to 2000 followed by a decrease from 2000 to 2005.

We further compare our model-derived wetland emissions with those from Wetland Model Inter-comparison of Models Project (WETCHIMP) (Melton et al., 2013; Wania et al., 2013). We conducte two different comparisons: one comparison includes all models with their different wetland determination schemes while the other focuses on models that are driven by satellite inundation datasets (see Table 1, Melton et al., 2013).

20

Each model analyzed in Melton et al. (2013) uses a different wetland parameterization to estimate their wetland extent (see Table 1 in Melton et al., 2013 for details). Therefore, it is not surprising to see the large variation in the wetland extent among

all these models from 1993–2004 (Fig. 17). Amongst the models analyzed in Melton et al. (2013) only the LPJ-WSL model uses a prescribed monthly inundation datasets, similar to our simulations (Fig. 17). DLEM\_norice prescribes maximum extents at each gridcell from satellite inundation datasets but with simulated intra-annual dynamics. All



the simulations making use of the satellite measurements (this study, LPJ-WSL, BGC, and DLEM\_norice) show a decrease in wetland extents from 1993–2004. The wetland extent anomalies in DLEM\_norice simulations differ as the intra-annual dynamics are simulated (Fig. 17).

The models that do not use a prescribed satellite inundation dataset do not simulate notable decreases in wetland extents during the period of 1993–2004. This is not in agreement with the satellite inundation dataset: Papa et al. (2010) find ~ 5.7% decrease in mean annual maximum inundation from 1993 to 2004 with maximum decrease in the tropics. In fact, all models (excluding LPJ-WSL, DLEM\_norice, and this study) show large increases in wetland extents in 1998 compared to that in 1997, which is also documented in Melton et al. (2013).

Melton et al. (2013) demonstrate that the difference in wetland area used in different models might partially explain the discrepancy in model estimated wetland emissions. As shown in Melton et al. (2013), model-derived methane emissions are strongly corre-

- <sup>15</sup> lated with the wetland extent (with an average correlation of 0.90 on the global scale). All models that produce a peak methane emission in 1998 have a maximum wetland extent at the same time (Fig. 18). The difference in model-derived methane emission can be attributed partially to the different wetland area used in each model, where the wetland extent is highly uncertain (Melton et al., 2013). However, it should be noted
- that there are several limitations associated with using wetland extents derived from satellite inundation datasets. As suggested in Prigent et al. (2007), satellites might underestimate inundated areas due to their incapability to detect small water bodies. Further, satellite datasets only include fully inundated area and excluded unsaturated wet mineral soils, which might also be important wetland methane source (Spahni et al., 2011).

The methane emission anomalies in DLEM\_norice and LPJ\_WSL (the simulations in Melton et al. (2013) using satellite or satellite derived wetland extent) show similar temporal variations, as do the methane anomalies in CN\_a and CN\_b simulations (Fig. 19). Emissions estimated in CN\_a, CN\_b, DLEM\_norice, and LPJ\_WSL peak in



1993–1994 and decrease since then. Such a decreasing trend is consistent with the decrease in wetland extents used in these models (Fig. 17). The CN\_a and CN\_b simulations show a large increase in emissions from 1993 to 1994, but do not simulate large increases in methane emissions from 2001 to 2002 even though wetland extents

increase during this period. It should be noted that the BGC simulation uses the same wetland extent as CN\_a and CN\_b but does not give the same large decrease in the emissions during the period of 1993–2004. In fact, the BGC model gives decreasing emissions from 1993–1994 but increasing methane emissions from 2001–2002. The BGC model also shows that the highest emission occurs in 1998 and the lowest in 1999 during the period of 1993–2004.

Both the large increase in the methane emissions from 1993 to 1994 in CN\_a and CN\_b and the small increase from 2001 to 2002 are likely due to the changes in heterotrophic respiration (HR) in CN\_a simulations (Fig. 20). HR increases dramatically in CN\_a from 1993 to 1994 (Fig. 20) driving higher methane emissions whereas the de-

- <sup>15</sup> crease in HR from 2001 to 2002 decreases wetland methane production, which might offset the increase in methane emissions from wetland extents. The HR in the BGC simulation is rather different, consistent with the different behavior between CN\_a and CN\_b and the BGC simulations. Zhao et al. (2005) estimate the net primary production (NPP) from satellites and found that NPP in 2001 is higher than those in 2002 and
- 2003. Please note that NPP is closely related to HR. The correlation of global wetland emissions with HR and wetland extents is 0.81 and 0.94, respectively, in CN\_a simulations. In BGC simulations, simulated global wetland emissions are also highly correlated with HR (0.89) and with wetland extents (0.81), respectively. Such high correlations suggest that both HR and wetland extents are dominate drivers of wetland
- <sup>25</sup> methane emissions in CN\_a and BGC models. Thus, although BGC experiment uses the same satellite inundated area in CN\_a, it does not produce a decreasing trend in methane emissions during the period, probably due to its different trend in HR estimated in BGC as compared with that in CN\_a (Fig. 20).



#### 4 Conclusions

In this study, we evaluate the temporal and spatial patterns in wetland methane emissions simulated in the CLM4Me' from both CLM4.0 (CN\_a and CN\_b) and CLM4.5 (BGC). We show strong seasonal and inter-annual variations in wetland methane emis-

sions. In both CN\_a and BGC the largest methane emissions occur in the Northern Hemisphere summer. There are several large differences in the inter-annual and spatial variations in CN\_a and BGC wetland emissions. On an inter-annual basis during the period of 1993–2004, methane emissions simulated in CN\_a peak in 1994 and decrease thereafter. Such a decrease is consistent with a decreasing tropical inundated area, based on observations (Papa et al., 2010; Prigent et al., 2007). Since CN\_a experiment has very strong tropical emissions, changes in the tropics dominated the global emissions.

On the other hand, CLM4Me' methane emissions driven by CLM4.5 (the BGC simulation) are highest in 1999 and do not show the significant decrease during the period

1993–2004. Compared to CN\_a simulations, BGC produces large emissions in the high latitudes with very strong seasonal variations and relatively small wetland emissions in the tropical region. The spatial distribution of emission differences between the four highest and lowest emissions years in the BGC simulation show the large differences in the high latitudes, tropics, and Southern Hemisphere (around 30° S) in BGC
 (Koven et al., 2013).

The comparison of the IAV demonstrates large disagreements between different estimates of the annual wetland emissions. CN\_a wetland emissions suggest a decreasing trend from 1994 to 2004, which is similar to those estimates from Ringeval et al. (2010) and DLEM\_norice and LPJ-WSL models (Melton et al., 2013; Wania et al., 2013). The

<sup>25</sup> updated estimate from Bousquet et al. (2006) gives increasing emissions from 1991– 2000 and a decrease after 2000. A few participating wetland emission models in the WETCHIM project also predict a peak methane emission in the middle of the period (around 1998–1999). For instance, all models (excluding DLEM\_norice and LPJ-WSL)



that estimate a peak methane emission in 1998 also produce a peak wetland extent during the same period of 1993–2004. Such discrepancy in the trend produced in different models suggests that wetland extents play an important role in controlling wetland emissions and large uncertainties exist in wetland extents and wetland methane emis-

- sions, in support of the conclusions from Melton et al. (2013). In addition to wetland extents, the model simulated carbon pool also has a significant impact on methane emissions (Bloom et al., 2012; Riley et al., 2011). For instance, although satellite inundated area increased from 2001 to 2002, CN\_a estimates small increases in methane emissions from 2001 to 2002 due to decreases in HR. BGC produces different methane
   emissions in terms of spatial and temporal trends, probably due to the shift of carbon
- uptake and release from tropics to high latitudes as a result of multi-level biogeochemistry in BGC (Koven et al., 2013).

Our results also suggest that the relative magnitude of seasonal vs. inter-annual variability (IAV) of atmospheric methane concentrations for the period of 1993–2004 <sup>15</sup> are dependent on which model version. IAV is relatively higher than the seasonal variability across the globe in CN\_a, while in BGC, IAV is much higher than the seasonal variability except for the northern latitudes (> 50° N). Both anthropogenic sources and wetlands contribute significantly to seasonal variations of atmospheric methane concentrations in CN a and BGC. On the inter-annual scale, wetland emissions dominate

the global inter-annual variability when CAM-chem is forced with either the CN\_a or BGC methane emissions, in agreement with findings in Bousquet et al. (2006).

Given the fact that CN\_a and BGC methane emissions are at the high end of current estimates (Denman et al., 2007), we decrease CN\_a and BGC methane emissions evenly at the global scale to match those used in the TransCom experiment and keep the original spatial distribution. Our results show that CN\_b simulations (with reduced CN\_a wetland emissions) is able to better produce observed atmospheric methane concentrations and observed N–S gradient in methane concentrations, suggesting that CN\_a might overestimate the current wetland emissions. In the BGC experiment, modeled atmospheric interannual variability in concentrations has stronger correlations with



observations than CN\_a and CN\_b simulations. In the TransCom experiment, the magnitude of the correlation between modeled atmospheric concentrations and observations is similar to that of the BGC experiment. We also find that CN\_b experiments tend to underestimate the growth rate and BGC overestimates it in high latitudes. TransCom

- simulations have an overall better estimation of the growth rate at all stations than the other three simulations. In terms of the N-S gradients, CN b experiments have the closest match with observations among all experiments. BGC overestimated the N-S gradients by  $\sim$  70% while CN a and TransCom underestimate it by  $\sim$  10 and  $\sim$  20%, respectively. Please note that BGC uses much higher methane emissions from the high
- latitudes (> 50° N) than CN a and CN b experiments. These simulations generally sug-10 gest that the high latitude methane emissions should be somewhere in the broad range between those used in CN\_b ( $\sim 7.7 \text{ Tg yr}^{-1}$ ) and BGC ( $\sim 97 \text{ Tg yr}^{-1}$ ). This study confirms that the large variation in methane emissions exist and they play an important role in affecting atmospheric methane concentration (Bousguet et al., 2006).
- In CN a simulations, tropical wetlands contribute to approximately 78% of the global 15 wetland fluxes and high latitudes (> 50° N) only release less than 10 % of the global wetland fluxes. While in BGC, high latitude wetlands contribute more to the global wetland fluxes than the tropical wetlands. Both CN\_a and BGC methane simulations are forced with the same satellite inundated fraction, they produce large differences in both spatial
- and temporal variations of methane emissions due to the fact that CN a and BGC use 20 different carbon cycle models. This suggests that model estimated methane budget is sensitive not only to wetland extents, but also to the carbon pool where the methane is produced (Melton et al., 2013). Further research might need to focus on regional wetlands (such as high-latitude and tropical wetlands) in order to have a better estimate of
- wetland methane budget and its spatial variation. 25

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank Joe Melton for providing model datasets from the Wetland and Wetland CH<sub>4</sub> Inter-comparison of Models Project (WETCHIMP). Part of the work was supported by NASA grant DE-SC0006791.



#### References

- Bloom, A. A., Palmer, P. I., Fraser, A., Reay, D. S., and Frankenberg, C.: Large-Scale Controls of Methanogenesis Inferred from Methane and Gravity Spaceborne Data, Science, 327, 322– 325, 2010.
- <sup>5</sup> Bloom, A. A., Palmer, P. I., Fraser, A., and Reay, D. S.: Seasonal variability of tropical wetland CH<sub>4</sub> emissions: the role of the methanogen-available carbon pool, Biogeosciences, 9, 2821– 2830, doi:10.5194/bg-9-2821-2012, 2012.
  - Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Miller, J. B., Dlugokencky, E. J., Hauglustaine, D. A., Prigent, C., Van der Werf, G. R., Peylin, P., Brunke, E. G., Carouge, C., Langenfelds, R. L., Lathiere, J.,
- Papa, F., Ramonet, M., Schmidt, M., Steele, L. P., Tyler, S. C., and White, J.: Contribution of anthropogenic and natural sources to atmospheric methane variability, Nature, 443, 439– 443, doi:10.1038/Nature05132, 2006.
  - Butler, J. H., Daube, B. C., Dutton, G. S., Elkins, J. W., Hall, B. D., Hurst, D. F., King, D. B., Kling, E. S., Lafleur, B. G., Lind, J., Lovitz, S., Mondeel, D. J., Montzka, S. A., Moore, F. L.,
- Nance, J. D., Neu, J. L., Romashkin, P. R., Sheffer, A., and Snible, W. J.: Halocarbons and other atmospheric trace species, NOAA/US Department of Commerce, Boulder, Colorado, 2004.
  - Cunnold, D. M., Steele, L. P., Fraser, P. J., Simmonds, P. G., Prinn, R. G., Weiss, R. F., Porter, L. W., O'Doherty, S., Langenfelds, R. L., Krummel, P. B., Wang, H. J., Emmons, L., Tie, X.
- X., and Dlugokencky, E. J.: In situ measurements of atmospheric methane at GAGE/AGAGE sites during 1985–2000 and resulting source inferences, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 107, ACH 20-1–ACH 20-18, doi:10.1029/2001JD001226, 2002.
  - Denman, K. L., Brasseur, G., Chidthaisong, A., Ciais, P., Cox, P. M., Dickinson, R. E., Hauglustaine, D., Heinze, C., Holland, E., Jacob, D., Lohmann, U., Ramachandran, S., da Silva Dias,
- P. L., Wofsy, S. C., and Zhang, X.: Couplings Between Changes in the Climate System and Biogeochemistry, in: Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, edited by: Solomon, S., Qin, D., Manning, M., Chen, Z., Marquis, M., Averyt, K. B., Tignor, M., and Miller, H. L., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, 2007.
  - Dlugokencky, E. J., Myers, R. C., Lang, P. M., Masarie, K. A., Crotwell, A. M., Thoning, K. W., Hall, B. D., Elkins, J. W., and Steele, L. P.: Conversion of NOAA atmospheric dry air CH<sub>4</sub>



mole fractions to a gravimetrically prepared standard scale, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 110, D18306, doi:10.1029/2005JD006035, 2005.

Fung, I., John, J., Lerner, J., Matthews, E., Prather, M., Steele, L. P., and Fraser, P. J.: 3-Dimensional Model Synthesis of the Global Methane Cycle, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 96, 13033–13065, 1991.

5

- Gent, P. R., Danabasoglu, G., Donner, L. J., Holland, M. M., Hunke, E. C., Jayne, S. R., Lawrence, D. M., Neale, R. B., Rasch, P. J., Vertenstein, M., Worley, P. H., Yang, Z. L., and Zhang, M. H.: The Community Climate System Model Version 4, J. Climate, 24, 4973–4991, 2011.
- Giglio, L., Randerson, J. T., van der Werf, G. R., Kasibhatla, P. S., Collatz, G. J., Morton, D. C., and DeFries, R. S.: Assessing variability and long-term trends in burned area by merging multiple satellite fire products, Biogeosciences, 7, 1171–1186, doi:10.5194/bg-7-1171-2010, 2010.

Ito, A. and Inatomi, M.: Use of a process-based model for assessing the methane budgets of global terrestrial ecosystems and evaluation of uncertainty Biogeosciences, 9, 759–773

of global terrestrial ecosystems and evaluation of uncertainty, Biogeosciences, 9, 759–773, doi:10.5194/bg-9-759-2012, 2012.

Jauhiainen, J., Takahashi, H., Heikkinen, J. E. P., Martikainen, P. J., and Vasander, H.: Carbon fluxes from a tropical peat swamp forest floor, Glob. Change Biol., 11, 1788–1797, 2005.Keller, M. M.: Biological sources and sinks of methane in tropical habitats and tropical atmo-

- <sup>20</sup> spheric chemistry, Dissertation Thesis, Princeton University, 216 pp., 1990. Kirschke, S., Bousquet, P., Ciais, P., Saunois, M., Canadell, J. G., Dlugokencky, E. J., Bergamaschi, P., Bergmann, D., Blake, D. R., Bruhwiler, L., Cameron-Smith, P., Castaldi, S., Chevallier, F., Feng, L., Fraser, A., Heimann, M., Hodson, E. L., Houweling, S., Josse, B., Fraser, P.
- J., Krummel, P. B., Lamarque, J. F., Langenfelds, R. L., Le Quere, C., Naik, V., O'Doherty, S.,
  Palmer, P. I., Pison, I., Plummer, D., Poulter, B., Prinn, R. G., Rigby, M., Ringeval, B., Santini,
  M., Schmidt, M., Shindell, D. T., Simpson, I. J., Spahni, R., Steele, L. P., Strode, S. A., Sudo,
  K., Szopa, S., van der Werf, G. R., Voulgarakis, A., van Weele, M., Weiss, R. F., Williams,
  J. E., and Zeng, G.: Three decades of global methane sources and sinks, Nat. Geosci., 6, 813–823, 2013.
- <sup>30</sup> Kistler, R., Kalnay, E., Collins, W., Saha, S., White, G., Woollen, J., Chelliah, M., Ebisuzaki, W., Kanamitsu, M., Kousky, V., van den Dool, H., Jenne, R., and Fiorino, M.: The NCEP-NCAR 50-year reanalysis: Monthly means CD-ROM and documentation, B. Am. Meteorol. Soc., 82, 247–267, 2001.



- Koven, C. D., Riley, W. J., Subin, Z. M., Tang, J. Y., Torn, M. S., Collins, W. D., Bonan, G. B., Lawrence, D. M., and Swenson, S. C.: The effect of vertically resolved soil biogeochemistry and alternate soil C and N models on C dynamics of CLM4, Biogeosciences, 10, 7109–7131, doi:10.5194/bg-10-7109-2013, 2013.
- Lamarque, J.-F., Emmons, L. K., Hess, P. G., Kinnison, D. E., Tilmes, S., Vitt, F., Heald, C. L., Holland, E. A., Lauritzen, P. H., Neu, J., Orlando, J. J., Rasch, P. J., and Tyndall, G. K.: CAMchem: description and evaluation of interactive atmospheric chemistry in the Community Earth System Model, Geosci. Model Dev., 5, 369–411, doi:10.5194/gmd-5-369-2012, 2012. Melton, J. R., Wania, R., Hodson, E. L., Poulter, B., Ringeval, B., Spahni, R., Bohn, T., Avis,
- C. A., Beerling, D. J., Chen, G., Eliseev, A. V., Denisov, S. N., Hopcroft, P. O., Lettenmaier, D. P., Riley, W. J., Singarayer, J. S., Subin, Z. M., Tian, H., Zürcher, S., Brovkin, V., van Bodegom, P. M., Kleinen, T., Yu, Z. C., and Kaplan, J. O.: Present state of global wetland extent and wetland methane modelling: conclusions from a model inter-comparison project (WETCHIMP), Biogeosciences, 10, 753–788, doi:10.5194/bg-10-753-2013, 2013.
- <sup>15</sup> Meng, L., Hess, P. G. M., Mahowald, N. M., Yavitt, J. B., Riley, W. J., Subin, Z. M., Lawrence, D. M., Swenson, S. C., Jauhiainen, J., and Fuka, D. R.: Sensitivity of wetland methane emissions to model assumptions: application and model testing against site observations, Biogeosciences, 9, 2793–2819, doi:10.5194/bg-9-2793-2012, 2012.

Mitchell, T. D. and Jones, P. D.: An improved method of constructing a database of monthly

- climate observations and associated high-resolution grids, Int. J. Climatol., 25, 693–712, 2005.
  - Montzka, S. A., Krol, M., Dlugokencky, E., Hall, B., Jockel, P., and Lelieveld, J.: Small Interannual Variability of Global Atmospheric Hydroxyl, Science, 331, 67–69, 2011.

Olivier, J. G. J. and Berdowski, J. J. M.: Global emissions sources and sinks, The Climate

- <sup>25</sup> System, edited by: Berdowski, J., Guicherit, R., and Heij, B. J., Swets & Zeitlinger Pub., Lisse, the Netherlands, 2001.
  - Papa, F., Prigent, C., Aires, F., Jimenez, C., Rossow, W. B., and Matthews, E.: Interannual variability of surface water extent at the global scale, 1993–2004, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 115, D12111, doi:10.1029/2009JD012674, 2010.
- Patra, P. K., Houweling, S., Krol, M., Bousquet, P., Belikov, D., Bergmann, D., Bian, H., Cameron-Smith, P., Chipperfield, M. P., Corbin, K., Fortems-Cheiney, A., Fraser, A., Gloor, E., Hess, P., Ito, A., Kawa, S. R., Law, R. M., Loh, Z., Maksyutov, S., Meng, L., Palmer, P. I., Prinn, R. G., Rigby, M., Saito, R., and Wilson, C.: TransCom model simulations of



 $CH_4$  and related species: linking transport, surface flux and chemical loss with  $CH_4$  variability in the troposphere and lower stratosphere, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 11, 12813–12837, doi:10.5194/acp-11-12813-2011, 2011.

- Popova, Z. and Kercheva, M.: CERES model application for increasing preparedness to climate
   variability in agricultural planning calibration and validation test, Phys. Chem. Earth, 30, 125–133, 2005.
  - Prigent, C., Papa, F., Aires, F., Rossow, W. B. and Matthews, E.: Global inundation dynamics inferred from multiple satellite observations, 1993–2000, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 112, D12107, doi:10.1029/2006JD007847, 2007.
- Qian, T. T., Dai, A., Trenberth, K. E., and Oleson, K. W.: Simulation of global land surface conditions from 1948 to 2004. Part I: Forcing data and evaluations, J. Hydrometeorol., 7, 953–975, 2006.
  - Rigby, M., Prinn, R. G., Fraser, P. J., Simmonds, P. G., Langenfelds, R. L., Huang, J., Cunnold, D. M., Steele, L. P., Krummel, P. B., Weiss, R. F., O'Doherty, S., Salameh, P. K., Wang, H.
- J., Harth, C. M., Mühle, J., and Porter, L. W.: Renewed growth of atmospheric methane, Geophys. Res. Lett., 35, L22805, doi:10.1029/2008GL036037, 2008.
  - Riley, W. J., Subin, Z. M., Lawrence, D. M., Swenson, S. C., Torn, M. S., Meng, L., Mahowald, N. M., and Hess, P.: Barriers to predicting changes in global terrestrial methane fluxes: analyses using CLM4Me, a methane biogeochemistry model integrated in CESM, Biogeosciences, 8, 1925–1953, doi:10.5194/bg-8-1925-2011, 2011.
  - Shannon, R. D. and White, J. R.: 3-Year Study of Controls on Methane Emissions from 2 Michigan Peatlands, Biogeochemistry, 27, 35–60, 1994.

20

30

- Simmons, A. J. and Gibson, J. K.: The ERA-40 Project Plan, ERA-40 Project Report Series 1, 63 pp., 2000.
- Spahni, R., Wania, R., Neef, L., van Weele, M., Pison, I., Bousquet, P., Frankenberg, C., Foster, P. N., Joos, F., Prentice, I. C., and van Velthoven, P.: Constraining global methane emissions and uptake by ecosystems, Biogeosciences, 8, 1643–1665, doi:10.5194/bg-8-1643-2011, 2011.

Taylor, K. E.: Summarizing multiple aspects of model performance in a single diagram, J. Geophys. Res.-Atmos., 106, 7183–7192, 2001.

Thornton, P. E., Lamarque, J. F., Rosenbloom, N. A., and Mahowald, N. M.: Influence of carbonnitrogen cycle coupling on land model response to CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization and climate variability, Global Biogeochem. Cy., 21, Gb4018, doi:10.1029/2006gb002868, 2007.



- Thornton, P. E., Doney, S. C., Lindsay, K., Moore, J. K., Mahowald, N., Randerson, J. T., Fung, I., Lamarque, J.-F., Feddema, J. J., and Lee, Y.-H.: Carbon-nitrogen interactions regulate climate-carbon cycle feedbacks: results from an atmosphere-ocean general circulation model, Biogeosciences, 6, 2099–2120, doi:10.5194/bg-6-2099-2009, 2009.
- s van der Werf, G. R., Randerson, J. T., Giglio, L., Collatz, G. J., Kasibhatla, P. S., and Arellano Jr., A. F.: Interannual variability in global biomass burning emissions from 1997 to 2004, Atmos. Chem. Phys., 6, 3423–3441, doi:10.5194/acp-6-3423-2006, 2006.
  - Wania, R., Melton, J. R., Hodson, E. L., Poulter, B., Ringeval, B., Spahni, R., Bohn, T., Avis, C. A., Chen, G., Eliseev, A. V., Hopcroft, P. O., Riley, W. J., Subin, Z. M., Tian, H., van Bodegom,
- P. M., Kleinen, T., Yu, Z. C., Singarayer, J. S., Zürcher, S., Lettenmaier, D. P., Beerling, D. J., 10 Denisov, S. N., Prigent, C., Papa, F., and Kaplan, J. O.: Present state of global wetland extent and wetland methane modelling: methodology of a model inter-comparison project (WETCHIMP), Geosci. Model Dev., 6, 617-641, doi:10.5194/gmd-6-617-2013, 2013.

Wuebbles, D. J. and Hayhoe, K.: Atmospheric methane and global change., Earth-Sci. Rev.,

57. 177-210. 2002. 15

Xu, X. F., Tian, H. Q., Zhang, C., Liu, M. L., Ren, W., Chen, G. S., Lu, C. Q., and Bruhwiler, L.: Attribution of spatial and temporal variations in terrestrial methane flux over North America, Biogeosciences, 7, 3637–3655, doi:10.5194/bg-7-3637-2010, 2010.

Discussion Pa	<b>B(</b> 12, 2161–2	<b>GD</b> 2212, 2015
aper   Discussion	Season inter-a variability methane o L. Men	nal and annual in wetland emissions ig et al.
Paper	Title	Page
Discussio	Conclusions Tables	References Figures
n Paper	14 4	>I >
Discuss	Back Full Scre	Close een / Esc
sion Paper	Printer-frier	Discussion

#### Table 1. Comparison of the methane sources in the four simulations used in this study.

Input Data	TransCom	CN_a	CN_b	BGC
Anthropogenic Emissions	$OB2001^{1}$	0.72*OB2001	OB2001	OB2001
Wetland emissions	Ito and Inatomi, 2012	CLM4.0 <sup>2</sup>	0.64*CLM4.0 <sup>2</sup>	0.74*CLM4.5 <sup>3</sup>
Rice paddy emissions	Ito and Inatomi, 2012	CLM4.0	CLM4.0	CLM4.5
Termite emissions	Fung et al. (1991)	Fung et al. (1991)	Fung et al. (1991)	Fung et al. (1991)
Fire emissions	GFED v2 <sup>4</sup>	GFED v3	GFED v3	GFED v3

<sup>1</sup> OB2001 refers to the anthropogenic methane emissions in Olivier and Berdowski (2001).

<sup>2</sup> CLM4.0 refers to the methane emissions estimate in the CLM4.0 model as used in Meng et al. (2012).

 $^3_{\star}$  CLM4.5 refers to the methane emissions estimated in CLM4.5 model.

<sup>4</sup> GFED indicates the Global Fire Emission Database.

Note: the global total averaged emissions for the study period used in the TransCom, CN\_a, and CN\_b, BGC are the same, but spatial distribution of methane emissions might be different.

<b>Discussion</b> Pa	<b>B(</b> 12, 2161–	<b>BGD</b> 12, 2161–2212, 2015				
per   Discussion	Season inter-a variability methane L. Mer	Seasonal and inter-annual variability in wetland methane emissions L. Meng et al.				
Paper	Title	Page				
—	Abstract	Introduction				
Discussio	Conclusions Tables	References Figures				
n P	14	►I.				
aper	•	•				
—	Back	Close				
Discuss	Full Scr	Full Screen / Esc				
ion	Printer-trie	Printer-friendly Version				
Paper		Discussion				

<b>Table 2.</b> A list of stations used in this study.	
--	--

Station Name	ID	Lat	Lon	Elevation (m)	Data Availability
South Pole	spo	-89.98	24.80° W	2810	Feb 1983–Current
Cape Grim	cgo	-40.68	144.68° E	94	Jan 1984–Current
Tutuila (Cape Matatula)	smo	-14.24	170.57° W	42	Apr 1983–Current
Ascension Island (UK)	asc	-7.92	14.42° W	54	May 1983–Current
Cape Kumukahi	kum	19.52	154.82° W	3	Apr 1983–Current
Mauna Loa	mlo	19.54	155.58° W	3397	May 1983–Current
Mt. Waliguan	wlg	36.28	100.90° E	3810	May 1991–Current
Tae-ahn Peninsula	tap	36.72	126.12° E	20	Mar 1991–Current
Niwot Ridge	nwr	40.05	105.59° W	3523	Jun 1983–Current
Mace Head (Ireland)	mhd	53.33	9.90° W	8	Jun 1991–Current
Cold Bay	cba	55.2	162.72° W	25	May 1983–Current
Barrow	brw	71.32	156.60° W	11	Jan 1986–Current
Zeppelinfjellet (Norway)	zep	78.9	11.88° E	475	May 1994–Current
Alert (Canada)	alt	82.45	62.52° W	210	Jun 1985–Current



Table 3. Comparison of the mean growth rat	e of atmospheric methane concentration in each
simulation with observations.	

StationID	lat	Obs	TransCom	CN_a	CN_b	BGC
spo	-89.98	4.61	6.11	5.05	3.62	6.44
cgo	-40.68	4.64	5.96	4.86	5.67	6.35
smo	-14.24	4.44	5.34	4.21	5.09	5.87
asc	-7.92	4.23	5.72	4.57	5.55	6.29
kum	19.52	3.75	4.21	3.37	4.12	5.46
mlo	19.53	3.95	4.37	3.46	4.28	5.59
wlg	36.28	4.39	4.3	3.27	4.37	6.34
tae	36.72	3.2	3.72	2.92	3.89	4.88
nwr	40.05	4.16	4.4	3.49	4.27	5.56
mhd	53.33	3.92	2.78	1.98	2.98	4.52
cba	55.20	3.77	3.97	3.31	3.81	6.2
brw	71.32	3.27	3.42	2.92	3.35	6.42
zep	78.90	3.42	0.92	-0.48	1.99	4.2
alt	82.45	4.6	3.67	3.08	3.65	5.47
Average		4.03	4.21	3.29	4.05	5.69

Discussion Pap	<b>B(</b> 12, 2161–2	<b>GD</b> 2212, 2015				
Ē	Seasor	hal and				
—	Inter-a	innual				
	methane a					
scussion	L. Men	L. Meng et al.				
Pa						
per	Title	Page				
	Abstract	Introduction				
Dis	Conclusions	References				
SSNC	Tables	Figures				
ion	_					
Pap	14	► I				
)er	•	•				
—	Back	Close				
Discu	Full Scre	een / Esc				
ssion	Printer-frier	ndly Version				
Pap	Interactive	Discussion				
er	œ	<b>D</b> BY				

**Table 4.** Model performance statistics including the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and bias. Bias is calculated as the absolute deviation of the mean between model simulations and observations.

	N–S Gradients	Growth Rate				Interannual Variability			
RMSE		South Pole	Mauna Loa	Niwot Ridge	Alert	South Pole	Mauna Loa	Niwot Ridge	Alert
TransCom CN_a CN_b BGC	25.92 17.57 5.39 69.62	5.41 0.57 0.59 0.67	3.55 4.22 5.74 7.78	2.44 2.88 4.19 6.81	11.65 5.13 6.06 30.88	10.47 12.65 11.32 8.88	8.28 13.96 12.1 13.97	7.35 14.59 11.88 10.89	8.69 15.06 12.03 14.18
Bias		South Pole	Mauna Loa	Niwot Ridge	Alert	South Pole	Mauna Loa	Niwot Ridge	Alert
TransCom CN_a CN_b BGC	0.26 0.17 0.02 0.71	0.58 0.03 0.07 0.06	0.3 0.05 0.06 1.36	0.22 0.29 0.34 1.29	-1.69 -1.05 -0.72 -3.13	0.08 0.02 0.03 0.01	0.01 0.02 0.02 0.02	0.02 0.03 0.02 0.02	0.01 0.04 0.03 0.04





**Figure 1.** Comparison of the time series of combined methane emissions from wetlands and rice paddies used in the TransCom (Patra et al., 2011), CN\_a, CN\_b, and BGC experiments. Note that the average methane budget over the period of 1993–2004 is the same in the TransCom, CN\_a, CN\_b, and BGC experiments. CN\_b is the reduced CN\_a.





**Figure 2.** Comparison of the inter-annual variation in methane emissions from fire in the GFED v2 (van De Werf et al., 1996) and GFED v3 (Gilglio et al., 2010). These datasets are obtained from http://www.globalfiredata.org/.





**Figure 3.** The inter-annual anthropogenic methane emissions in the globe, tropics, mid-latitude, and high-latitude. These datasets are obtained from TransCom (Patra et al., 2010).





**Figure 4.** The difference in total emissions used in CN\_a, CN\_b, BGC experiments as compared with TransCom. A 12-month smoothing is also plotted for the difference of CN\_a (CN\_a – TransCom), CN\_b (CN\_b – TransCom), BGC (BGC – TransCom) with TransCom. Please note that the average of the difference in the period of 1993–2004 is zero.





**Figure 5.** Temporal variation of wetland CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes estimated in CN\_a (green) and BGC (blue). The globe is divided into three regions: Tropics (30° S–20° N), Mid-latitude (20–50° N), and high-latitude (>50° N). Please note that this is the original methane emissions produced by CN\_a and BGC without any multiplication. The smooth green and blue lines indicate the 12-month average wetland CH<sub>4</sub> fluxes for CN\_a and BGC.





Interactive Discussion











**Figure 8.** Absolute RMS variability (in ppb) from 1993–2004 of atmospheric  $CH_4$  concentration in  $CN_a$  experiment. The left panel shows seasonal RMS variability and the right panel indicates inter-annual RMS variability. From the top to the bottom are total RMS variability, anthropogenic contribution to total RMS variability, rice contribution to total RMS variability, and wetland contribution to RMS variability. Note that portional RMS variability of anthropogenic sources, rice paddies, and wetlands add up to >1 when cancellation among component tracers occurs in the summing of total  $CH_4$ .





**Figure 9.** Absolute RMS variability (in ppb) from 1993–2004 of atmospheric  $CH_4$  concentration in BGC experiment. The left panel shows seasonal RMS variability and the right panel indicates inter-annual RMS variability. From the top to the bottom are total RMS variability, anthropogenic contribution to total RMS variability, rice contribution to total RMS variability, and wetland contribution to RMS variability. Note that portional RMS variability of anthropogenic sources, rice paddies, and wetlands add up to > 1 when cancellation among component tracers occurs in the summing of total  $CH_4$ .





**Figure 10.** The interhemispheric gradients (N–S) in atmospheric  $CH_4$  concentration. The N–S gradients are calculated as the difference in atmospheric  $CH_4$  concentration in Northern and Southern Hemispheres at these stations listed in Table 1. The observational  $CH_4$  concentration dataset at these stations is from the World Data Centre for Greenhouse Gases (WDCGG) at http://ds.data.jma.go.jp/gmd/wdcgg/.











**Figure 12.** Taylor diagrams comparing the model inter-annual variability to methane observations at 14 stations. In this Taylor diagram, the angel from the *x* axis is the correlation coefficient between model and observed time series of atmospheric CH<sub>4</sub> concentration. The value on the radial axis is the ratio of standard deviation:  $\sigma_{model}/\sigma_{obs}$ . It represents the match between the amplitude of the model and observed inter-annual variability.











**Figure 14.** Atmospheric  $CH_4$  growth rate as a function of latitude in observations, TransCom,  $CN_a$ ,  $CN_b$ , and BGC simulations. 90% confidence intervals are also shown.





**Figure 15.** Taylor diagram comparing model N–S gradients (1), annual growth rates (2), and interannual variability (3) with observations for the South Pole, Mauna Loa, Niwot Ridge , and Alert (Canada) stations, respectively for the four simulations. The four stations are selected to represent the South Pole, tropics, mid-latitudes, and high latitudes. The annual growth rate is calculated as the difference between this year and previous year's mean methane concentration. The N–S gradients are from Fig. 10.





**Figure 16.** Comparison of the inter-annual variability in wetland  $CH_4$  emissions used in this study and in others. A centered 12-month running mean filter has been applied to smooth monthly output. Data for "LPJ variable source area", "LPJ", and "update of Bousquet et al. 2006 (constant OH)" are obtained from Spahni et al. (2011). "LPJ variable source area" indicates emissions anomalies for 1993-2000 calculated by using the observed monthly inundated area (Prigent et al., 2007). "LPJ" indicates global CH₄ emission anomalies simulated by LPJ (natural ecosystem and rice agriculture) for scenario SC2 listed on Spahni et al. (2011). "update of Bousquet et al. 2006 (constant OH)" refers to global wetland emission anomalies derived from long-term atmospheric synthesis inversion updated from Bousquet et al. (2006). TransCom refers to emission anomalies derived from the combined wetland and rice paddies emissions. Methane emissions in Ringeval et al. (2010) are estimated using the ORCHIDEE global vegetation model with a process-based wetland CH<sub>4</sub> emission model. The wetland area is prescribed to the observed monthly-inundated area (Prigent et al., 2007) in Ringeval et al. (2010). Please note that in this figure, "LPJ variable source area", "LPJ", and "update of Bousquet et al. 2006 (constant OH)" data are obtained from Spahni et al. (2011). The mean anomalies over 1993-2000 areadjusted to zero for the all data plotted on this graph.





**Figure 17.** 12-month smoothing of the anomalies in wetland areal extents used in the models that participate in WETCHIMP project (Melton et al., 2013; Wania et al., 2013) and in this study (satellite inundated area obtained from Prigent et al., 2007 and Papa et al., 2010). LPJ-Bern\_norice and DLEM\_norice are LPJ-Bern and DLEM models that do not include rice paddy simulations, respectively. These notifications indicate WETCHIP project also produce simulations with rice and only no rice simulations are included in this comparison study. In this figure, the long-term mean (1993–2004) is removed from each dataset.





**Figure 18.** Similar to Fig. 16, but for the models that participate in WETCHIMP (Melton et al., 2013; Wania et al., 2013). Each model uses a different wetland extent to estimate methane emissions (see Table 1 in Melton et al., 2013 for wetland determination scheme in each model). LPJ-WSL prescribes wetland area from monthly inundation dataset (Prigent et al., 2007; Papa et al., 2010). DLEM\_norice prescribes the maximum wetland area from the inundation dataset with simulated intra-annual dynamics. SDVGM uses the internal hydrological model to determine wetland locations. All other models parameterize wetland areas based on inundation dataset or land cover dataset that produce different inter-annual and intra-annual variability in wetland area. Please also refer to Melton et al. (2013) for detailed description of each model (SDGVM, LPJ-WSL, ORCHIDEE, LPJ-Bern\_norice, DLEM\_norice, CLM4Me).





**Figure 19.** Comparison of methane emission anomalies in CN\_a, CN\_b, BGC, DLEM\_norice, and LPJ-WSL. The anomalies are calculated by removing long-term average methane emissions during the period of 1993–2004.





**Figure 20.** Temporal variation of the anomalies in globally averaged heterotrophic respiration (HR) and net primary production (NPP) in CN\_a and BGC experiments. Blue dots indicate globally averaged NPP anomalies from satellites obtained from Zhao and Running (Zhao and Running, 2010).

