

Interactive comment on "A high-frequency atmospheric and seawater pCO_2 data set from 14 open ocean sites using a moored autonomous system" by A. J. Sutton et al.

A. J. Sutton et al.

adrienne.sutton@noaa.gov

Received and published: 29 August 2014

We thank all referees for their thoughtful and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript "A high-frequency atmospheric and seawater pCO2 data set from 14 open ocean sites using a moored autonomous system." The revised manuscript will be much improved as a result of the careful critiques. Below we discuss the comments from Referee #2 point by point including original referee comments and our responses bulleted underneath.

C205

Sutton et al. present a new set of high resolution mooring data of the sea surface and atmospheric pCO2 for the period 2004-2011 derived from a Moored Autonomous pCO2 system. The authors have done a great job to describe (a) the measurement system, (b) the processing of the data and (c) their uncertainty estimation. The data are easy to access and I am convinced that they will be widely used within the community and this manuscript will receive many citations. I would like to recommend the manuscript for publication after a few minor comments (below) have been addressed by the authors.

Specific Comments:

Page 388, lines 12-13: "::: scientific community identified that constraining ocean biogeochemical models would require much greater temporal and spatial resolution of field data." - please add a reference to this statement.

- Good point. We've added a reference to that statement.

Page 388, lines 21-22: "This level of accuracy has allowed the scientific community to constrain regional sea-air CO2 fluxes to 0.2 Pg C yr-1" - please add a reference to this statement

– That was an oversight that all of the reviewers pointed out. We've added references and explanation to that statement.

Page 388, lines 25-26: "... it has not solved the problem of quantifying temporal variability at a given location" - this statement is not quite correct. E.g. Watson et al. 2009 use underway data to investigate the variability at a given location, i.e. the subtropical North Atlantic. I suggest to change "at a given location" to "at a given point in space", to make the statement more clear.

- Thank you for the reference. We've modified that statement to be more specific as suggested.

Page 390, lines 19-22: "The LI-820 is calibrated before every measurement using a "zero CO2 reference" derived by scrubbing CO2 from air using soda lime and an ESRL

standard gas that spans the ocean pCO2 values where the system is deployed" - This information is repeated on page 391 lines 3-5 (where it fits better) and can be removed on page 390.

- Done.

Page 392, lines 19-20: A question out of interest: Why has the system been set so it would take a measurement every 3h and not e.g. more frequent?

- 3-hourly data allow us to constrain the daily cycle while maintaining enough battery for > 1 year deployments.

Page 393, lines 7-8: "... they have been deployed since 2011 and are not included in the finalized data set presented here" - Will they be included in the future, and – again out of interest – do you plan to update this data set on an annual, biannual, etc basis?

Yes. We plan to submit updated mooring data publications every 3-5 years as stations, methods, or additional parameters are updated or added to the data sets (e.g., pH).

Page 411, table 4: How do you account for the uncertainty attached to measurement of the underway systems, the pCO2 calculation from DIC and alkalinity or the globalview data?

 We do not account for the uncertainty of the measurements we use as comparison data. In this manuscript, we focus on making conservative estimates of uncertainty in the MAPCO2 measurements.

Reference: Watson, A. J., et al. (2009), Tracking the variable North Atlantic sink for atmospheric CO2., Science (New York, N.Y.), 326, 1391, doi: 10.1126/science.1177394

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 7, 385, 2014.

C207