Interactive comment on "Modulation of the North Atlantic Deoxygenation by The Slowdown of the Nutrient Stream" *by* Filippos Tagklis et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 10 June 2019

This study presents an analysis of output of dissolved O2, PO4, temperature, advective velocities, and sinking POC flux from four ESMs in the CMIP5 ensemble to investigate the drivers of upper ocean deoxygenation, comparing the North Atlantic to the North Pacific. The compensating effects of the temperature-controlled decrease in O2 solubility, ocean circulation/ventilation effects, and changes in biological O2 utilization are examined and attributed to identified trends in basin O2 content in the ESM outputs comparing the 1970-2000 period with the predicted 2070-2100 period under RCP 8.5 forcing. A contrasting pattern between the North Atlantic and North Pacific is identified, with deoxygenation proceeding more rapidly in the Pacific despite a smaller temperature increase in that basin. Solubility driven deoxygenation in the North Atlantic is revealed to be compensated for by a mechanism rooted in the slowdown of the AMOC,

which slows the important Gulf Stream nutrient stream, decreasing lateral injection of nutrients into the subtropical North Atlantic, decreasing export production and concomitant biological O2 utilization in the subsurface. Deoxygenation in the North Pacific is revealed to proceed via dual solubility and change in ventilation controls.

This is a well-written, clear, and concise manuscript detailing the authors study. I only have some comments regarding the Methods.

Line 81-83: What method was used to interpolate the model output to the common WOA grid?

Line 152-160: Why not perform a similar t-test as performed for O2 to test for statistical significance of the temperature increases identified?

Why were these 4 models chosen and not others from the CMIP5 ensemble? The given reason is that these 4 provided the variables of interest. Surely more than 4 CMIP5 models provide output of O2, PO4, temperature, advective velocities, and POC sinking flux for the historical and RCP8.5 cases?

Table 1: Why not include a column for the multi-model mean to be congruent with that which is provided in Figures 1-8?

Line 178: "The rate of solubility change...ranges from -12.07 μM to -14.81 μM" A rate implies a change with respect to another quantity or dimension, in this case time. I recommend switching these numbers to -0.12 μM/yr or mention the rate in parenthesis, etc.