

Interactive  
Comment

***Interactive comment on “Influence of seasonal monsoons on net primary production and CO<sub>2</sub> in subtropical Hong Kong coastal waters” by X. C. Yuan et al.***

**X. C. Yuan et al.**

xcyuan@scsio.ac.cn

Received and published: 20 October 2010

RC: Review of the paper “Influence of seasonal monsoons on net primary production and CO<sub>2</sub> in subtropical Hong Kong coastal waters”, by X.C Yuan, K.D. Yin, W.-J. Cai, A.Y.T. Ho, J. Xu and P.J. Harrison, submitted for publication to Biogeosciences. The paper “Influence of seasonal monsoons on net primary production and CO<sub>2</sub> in subtropical Hong Kong coastal waters” by Yuan and coworkers reports a detailed study with seasonal resolution of the CO<sub>2</sub> system and controlling factors in subtropical Hong Kong coastal waters. The paper provides relevant and exciting mechanistic understanding on the ramifications of physical and biological processes controlling

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

CO<sub>2</sub> and oxygen air-sea fluxes. The paper is on the concise side of publications, which I personally appreciate. In general, and beside some minor points, given below, the paper is appropriate for publication in Biogeosciences, except for two major points, of which I think, that they can be easily addressed:

RC: 1: There is no discussion at all about alkalinity and its potential influence on CO<sub>2</sub> air sea fluxes. The region is under influences of a larger river, and it can be assumed that alkalinity is released to the coastal system by the Pearl River. Further, the area is shallow, under influence of sewage/nutrient inputs and subjected to upwelling, all setting the stage for alkalinity generation within the system (see for example Thomas et al., 2009 in Biogeosciences). It is difficult for me to see whether and to what extent this might play a role, but it certainly needs to be addressed/discussed here, since alkalinity does affect CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes directly, but not the oxygen fluxes.

Response: We added a paragraph to discuss alkalinity: Alkalinity inputs could also influence the CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in Hong Kong waters, as alkalinity fluxes into the South China Sea was estimated to be  $462 \times 10^9$  mol yr<sup>-1</sup> from the PRE (Guo et al., 2008). In addition, alkalinity inputs may also come from anaerobic alkalinity generation in coastal sediments (Thomas et al., 2009), as well as year-round sewage discharges and upwelling in Hong Kong waters. These alkalinity inputs might increase the CO<sub>2</sub> buffer capacity in Hong Kong waters, but oxygen fluxes were not affected by alkalinity and showed no seasonal variations at all areas ( $p > 0.05$ , Fig. 4A). However, despite of the alkalinity inputs, surface pCO<sub>2</sub> and air-sea fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub> near the PRE were higher in the wet season than the dry season ( $p < 0.05$ , Fig. 4C), suggesting that the Pearl River was a strong source of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.

RC: 2: In my view there is massive confusion with signs of the fluxes throughout the manuscript, this to a degree that I have difficulties to follow the line of argument at times. I assume that authors overlook the consistency of their arguments, I have had problems with it. Based on the authors' flux equations (eqs. 2+3), a negative partial pressure difference of CO<sub>2</sub> or oxygen, which is an undersaturation of the surface

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

waters, leads to a positive  $\text{CO}_2$  flux according to Fick's law. This is also the convention since a positive  $\text{CO}_2$  flux increases the DIC/oxygen pools of the ocean. For example the statement in the abstract (as representative for many others): "...and net  $\text{CO}_2$  flux of  $\text{O}_2$  (-100+60 mmol  $\text{O}_2$  m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>)..." is simply contradictory. Similarly, if production terms (NPP, IPP) are positive, this means uptake of carbon ( $\text{CO}_2$ ), i.e., a reduction of the  $\text{CO}_2$  pool. Negative production terms are defined as respiration. Also, the respiration term is negative and elsewhere needs to be positive (positive respiration release DIC and consumes oxygen). It is also unclear to me why the authors invert the signs while setting up the carbon balance in Figure 7? A negative (!)  $\text{CO}_2$  flux, i.e., outgassing, does reduce the DIC pool of the water column, the sign thus gives in this case the right reflection of the process. NPP is indeed different, and one option would be to draw a box around the NPP figures in Figure seven, which would indicate the organic pool. Adding an arrow could then provide the direction of the  $\text{CO}_2$  flux into or out of the organic box, for example. If the authors wish to "adjust" the sign of NPP to the DIC pool perspective in the text, they might add redundant statements such as: a NPP of 3 mol C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>, corresponding to a change of the water column DIC -3mol C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>, would lead to..... A redundancy here is better than a misunderstanding. Again, the authors have to thoroughly check the consistency of their arguments throughout the paper to reformulate that their arguments are not affected by the confusion of the signs.

Response: We agree that negative values represent  $\text{CO}_2$  losses into the atmosphere and positive values are  $\text{CO}_2$  flux into water column in Figures, with the exception of NPP as positive NPP coincided with  $\text{CO}_2$  losses.

RC: Minor comments: Abstract, p5622, line 15: ... high positive NPP corresponding.... In my feeling a better word would be "paralleled" or "coinciding with", because high NPP corresponds to an increase uptake of  $\text{CO}_2$  / decreased  $\text{CO}_2$  release. I thought the point the authors wanted to make and wanted to later explain is this discrepancy?

Response: We use the word "coinciding with".

[Full Screen / Esc](#)
[Printer-friendly Version](#)
[Interactive Discussion](#)
[Discussion Paper](#)


RC: Introduction, p 5623, lines 10-15: A good reference to refer to would be Lendt et al., 2003, in JGR.

Response: We cited Lendt et al., (2003) in revised ms.

RC: Methods: p562: Please give details whether there were single or repeated occupations of the stations. Please also briefly discuss tidal effects and variability shorter than seasonal, if information is available.

Response: We added the tidal effects: In Hong Kong coastal waters, tides are mixed and predominantly semi-diurnal, and the mean tidal range is 1.7 m with a range from 1 m during neap tides to up to 2 m during spring tides with little seasonal tidal variation (Lee et al., 2006).

RC: P5626, lines 5-15: please give uncertainty of the computed pCO<sub>2</sub> and the related fluxes.

Response: The 0.01 pH error will result in the uncertainties of  $\pm 3\%$  pCO<sub>2</sub> (ca.  $15 \pm 6 \mu\text{atm CO}_2$ ) and  $\pm 10\%$  CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes (ca.  $3 \pm 2 \text{ mmol C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ ), which does not considerably affect our conclusion due to high pCO<sub>2</sub> in Hong Kong waters.

RC: P5627: line 9: What is estimated solubility? Please provide information on how the solubility was computed.

Response: The Bunsen coefficient ( $\alpha$ ) is the solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> at a given temperature and salinity. The CO<sub>2</sub> solubility coefficient was formulated by Weiss (1974). DO solubility was calculated according to Benson and Krause (1984).

RC: Results: p5929, l23: coastal

Response: Added

RC: Discussion: p5631, line 12: please give oxygen saturation value.

Response: We added: the dissolved oxygen (DO) remained  $>150 \mu\text{M}$  with a solubility

**BGD**

7, C3389–C3395, 2010

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



ranging from 210 to 240  $\mu\text{M}$  (Fig. 4A)

RC: P5632: A detailed discussion of this issue is given by Thomas et al., 2005 (Biogeosciences 2, 87-96). In summary I do not think this is a paradox, since the coastal ocean is far away from being an ideal 1-box system.

Response: We revised it as a “discrepancy” as you suggested above.

P5633, I16-17. Isn't this the trap the authors wanted to eliminate? NPP does not necessarily reverse the  $\dot{V}_{\text{CO}_2}$ , (positive) NPP does reduce  $\text{CO}_2$  release to the atmosphere, or strengthens  $\text{CO}_2$  uptake, thus, NPP shifts the  $\dot{V}_{\text{CO}_2}$  toward more positive values. This may correspond to a change in the direction of the  $\dot{V}_{\text{CO}_2}$ , but does not have to. Further, I think one point to mention here is the length of the integration time scales (observations, processes, computations). In principle, NPP does change the  $p\text{CO}_2$  and thus the  $\dot{V}_{\text{CO}_2}$ , as NPP is active. The response of the DIC/ $p\text{CO}_2$  is immediate. Only the  $\dot{V}_{\text{CO}_2}$  itself is slow and thus the response of the water column DIC inventory to the  $\dot{V}_{\text{CO}_2}$  delayed relative to NPP.

Response: We are studying seasonal variations, and hence the time lag between NPP and the flux was not obvious. But we agree that the statement that NPP does reduce  $\text{CO}_2$  release to the atmosphere, or strengthens  $\text{CO}_2$  uptake, thus, NPP shifts the  $\dot{V}_{\text{CO}_2}$  toward more positive values. Revised as: However, the air-sea exchange directions of  $\text{O}_2$  and  $\text{CO}_2$  were not reversed, although the high IPP and NPP could shift the  $\dot{V}_{\text{CO}_2}$  of  $\text{CO}_2$  toward more positive values.

RC: P5633, I20: DIC unit is mikro mol  $\text{kg}^{-1}$ . Or do you mean  $p\text{CO}_2$  rather than DIC?

Response: Yes, DIC should be  $\mu\text{M}$ . We revised it.

RC: P5634, I4: carbon rather than oxygen??

Response: Yes, it should be “DIC input”

RC: p5635, I21: latitudes?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Response: Yes, it should be “latitudes”

RC: P5635: Again, I think that Lendt et al., 2003, and also Borges et al., 2008, Biogeo-sciences 5(1), 141-155, would be appropriate to discuss here. Further, one other point to mention here is the possibility of different nutrient to carbon ratios in sinking organic matter and upwelled waters.

Response: We added a discussion: Borges et al. (2008) reported that enhanced up-welling may result in a decrease of the CO<sub>2</sub> sink during positive phase of the Southern Annular Mode (SAM) in high latitude areas of the Southern Ocean Southern and an increase of the CO<sub>2</sub> sink in the low latitude. The seasonal variations in the mixed layer depth was also reported by Lendt et al., (2003), in which mixed layer depth was 25 m before on set of southwest monsoon and less than 10 m when the upwelling was developed in the northwestern Arabian Sea. We also discussed the DON/DOP ratio: The seasonal variations in water circulation likely affected nutrient composition, as Wu et al, (2003) observed that N:P ratios in inorganic and organic matter were 1 to 10:1 (DIN/DIP) and 28:1 (DON/DOP) at the surface, and increased to 14:1 and >40:1 respectively below 200 m in a non-upwelling offshore region of the South China Sea. Therefore, the vertical mixing can easily alter N:P ratios at the surface. In contrast to Arabian Sea where the upwelling does not directly supply nitrate (Lendt et al., 2003), high nitrogen relative to phosphorus is brought up from the bottom in upwelled waters. In-situ experiments showed that BP was limited by phosphorus in the northern South China Sea, as bacterial demand of phosphorus was higher than phytoplankton (Yuan et al. submitted). In southern Hong Kong waters which was influence by both upwelling and lateral mixing of the PRE, BR was also limited by phosphorus (Yuan et al. 2010b), which partially reduced the decomposition of organic matter.

Figures:

RC: Fig 3: Please add sampling depths / locations to the panels.

Response: It is added.

**BGD**

7, C3389–C3395, 2010

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



RC: Fig 4a, c: Please adjust y-axis. There is no need to start a zero, if all values are much larger. In Fig 4c, please also indicate the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> value.

Response: We agree and adjust y-axis and indicate the atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> range

RC: Fig 5. There is not only a negative coefficient in the relationship, also CO<sub>2</sub> and oxygen fluxes differ by an order of magnitude. Please discuss this in the paper.

Response: We added a discussion: The air-sea fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub> varied from -3 mmol C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> in the eastern water to -40 mmol C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> near the Pearl River estuary (Fig. 4), while Zhai et al. (2005) reported that air-sea fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub> was 2 to -18 mmol C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> in inner/coastal shelf waters. The slope (0.17) between the air-sea fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> indicated that O<sub>2</sub> will re-equilibrate to atmospheric pressure more quickly than pCO<sub>2</sub> (Fig. 5), which was due to the fact that the ratio of fractional change in seawater pCO<sub>2</sub> to the fractional change in total DIC is ~10 (Revelle ratio) in the northern South China Sea (Zhai et al., 2009). Carrillo et al., (2004) reported that oxygen concentrations approach atmospheric equilibrium in approximately 30 days, while CO<sub>2</sub> only changed by approximately 12% during the same time span.

RC: In my print out there appear two boxes in the neg/neg and pos/pos quadrants. Is this a printer error or intentional? If intentional, please clarify.

Response: The figure was deleted now, and the regression was included in Table 2.

RC: Fig 7: As discussed above this figure remains a miracle, unless you adjust signs.

Response: We change all those signs.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 7, 5621, 2010.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)