Biogeosciences
Discussions

Open Access

EGU

BGD

Interactive
comment

Interactive comment on "Arctic Ocean acidification over the 21st century co-driven by anthropogenic carbon increases and freshening in the CMIP6 model ensemble" *by* Jens Terhaar et al.

Scott C. Doney (Referee)

sdoney@virginia.edu

Received and published: 11 January 2021

Review of: Arctic Ocean acidification over the 21st century co-driven by anthropogenic carbon increases and freshening in the CMIP6 model ensemble Jens Terhaar et al. 2020 Biogeosciences Discussions https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-456

The manuscript presents an analysis of an ensemble of coupled global climate-carbon cycle model simulations for the recent historical period through the end of this century. The models' Arctic Ocean inorganic carbon systems are analyzed to quantify the growth of the anthropogenic carbon inventory and the underlying driving factors related to ocean thermocline ventilation and freshwater/alkalinity trends. The approach follows

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

on prior studies using an earlier generation of Earth System Models (CMIP5) identifying substantial changes in CMIP6 model dynamics and the performance of a pair of so-called emergent constraints relating changes in carbon uptake and acidification to surface density (a metric of ventilation rates for mesopelagic ocean). Overall this is a well-constructed manuscript both in terms of the underlying analysis methodology and presentation, and this work is relevant to a number of science communities involved in climate and ocean carbon cycle science as well as marine ecology related to the impacts of ocean acidification. My recommendation is for minor edits to address my comments below that are primarily requests for clarifications on the methodology and results in the text.

Line 6 "the inter-model uncertainty of projected end-of-century Arctic Ocean Omega arag/calc"

Should this be the temporal change of saturation state comparing preindustrial minus end of century? This relates to the model bias correction described in Lines 120-125 using the GLODAP data. Would be useful to describe in abstract the data-based bias correction that is applied to the models.

Also need to clarify in Abstract when the text is describing the water-column (or whole Arctic) change or when discussion trends for particular depth levels (e.g., surface, mesopelagic).

Line 18-20 "In CMIP6, models generally better simulate maximum sea surface densities in the Arctic Ocean and consequently the transport of Cant into the Arctic Ocean interior, with simulated historical increases in Cant in improved agreement with observational products."

Perhaps description of improvement in model ocean physics would be better placed in abstract on Line 5 before discussion of carbon system.

Line 42-42 "Due to freshening and increasing Cant concentrations, the Arctic Ocean

C2

is projected to be the first large-scale ocean region to become undersaturated with respect to the metastable $CaCO_3$ polymorph aragonite (Omega arag < 1) (Steinacher et al., 2009)."

Clarify if referring to Steinacher et al. results on trends in Arctic surface ocean or full depth ocean.

Line 55 In the section on emergent constraints, is there any evidence that variations in extent of sea-ice loss affects local air-sea anthropogenic CO_2 uptake and thus inventory?

Line 84 "sedimentation now explicitly simulated in 10 out of 14 ESMs"

Does "sedimentation" here refer to gravitational particle sinking? Or does this refer to fluxes at the water-sediment surface? Please clarify.

Line 87 "Furthermore, the external carbon and nutrient sources"

How many of the CMIP6 models include dissolved inorganic carbon and alkalinity concentrations in river fluxes? It would be useful to expand Table 1 or add a Table 2 to display the differences in model treatment of freshwater inorganic carbon chemistry.

Line 104, Section 2.2 Some more detail is needed on the specific models and simulations used for the ocean biogeochemistry CMIP6 ensemble. For example, did all the coupled models follow the protocols outlined in:

Orr et al. 2017: Biogeochemical protocols and diagnostics for the CMIP6 Ocean Model Intercomparison Project (OMIP), Geoscientific Model Development, 10, 2169-2199, doi:10.5194/gmd-10-2169-2017

Also, given the importance of river input into the Arctic, some additional discussion is needed on the model treatment of river freshwater, inorganic and organic carbon, and alkalinity.

Line 115-118 "To quantify the effect of freshening on changes in AT, the AT anomalies

for each model were further decomposed into changes resulting from freshening and from the combined effect of other bio-geochemical processes by calculating the temporal evolution of salinity corrected alkalinity with a reference salinity of 35 following Lovenduski et al. (2007)."

A salinity correction implicitly assumes a freshwater end-member for alkalinity. For the Arctic was a non-zero end-member used to account for non-zero river alkalinity?

Line 241-243 "The resulting constrained estimate for the rescaled Arctic Ocean Cant inventory decreases from the low-emission scenario to the high-emission scenario from 12.3 to 10.7 Pg C."

Perhaps would be useful to clarify again that the rescaled constraint only informs the actual emergent constraint that is in Figure 2.

Line 251 "surface salinitities"

Should be "salinities"

Line 356 "dramatically reduced in CMIP5"

Should this read "dramatically reduced compared to the uncertainties in CMIP5"?

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-456, 2020.