We thank the reviewers for the time taken to carefully read the manuscript and the thorough review and comments. We have incorporated most in the edited copy and we feel that these changes have markedly improved the manuscript. We apologize for the somewhat sloppy and sometimes repetitive nature of the manuscript. The paper was created from separate contributions of the co-authors, and it also “suffered” from a late decision to provide this dedicated manuscript on the data. Parts were cut from the draft of the manuscript describing the science. (Wanninkhof, R., Trinanes, J. A., Park, G.-H., Gledhill, D. K., and Olsen, A.: Large Decadal Changes in Air-Sea CO2 Fluxes in the Caribbean Sea,, Journal of Geophysical Research, 10.1029/2019JC015366, 2019.). We have eliminated the repetitive sections.

While all the review comments were very useful, some are outside the scope of ESSD on the presentation of the datasets (see below). For the reviewers comments that pertain to interpretation we largely refer to the 2019 paper, or reference other key papers. We have referred to the Wanninkhof et al. 2019 paper several more times in the edits when appropriate. Specific responses are listed below embedded in the reviewers comments.

“Scope of ESSD: “Earth System Science Data (ESSD) is an international, interdisciplinary journal for the publication of articles on original research data (sets), furthering the reuse of high-quality data of benefit to Earth system sciences. The editors encourage submissions on original data or data collections which are of sufficient quality and have the potential to contribute to these aims.”
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A 17-year dataset of surface water fugacity of CO2, along with calculated pH, Aragonite saturation state, and air-sea CO2 fluxes in the Northern Caribbean Sea.

This manuscript presents a straightforward assessment of an impressive dataset taken in the Caribbean Sea aboard two cruise ships outfitted with state-of-the-art CO2 measurement equipment. The CO2 data along with modeled salinity (used to estimate TA), MLD and satellite SST were used in a year by year algorithm to estimate pH and Omega-aragonite. A statistical binning process is used to aggregate these data into 1-degree bins.

This work should be good to be published with minor revisions assuming the comments are addressed.

My most pressing concern centers on using separate fitting algorithms for each year. The authors need to justify this. A quick glance reveals that the differences in the coefficients are quite large year by year. Why wouldn’t it make more sense to do this by aggregating seasonal data? When considering the time series data: what would be the effect of the use of annual estimates rather than a single fitting? For example, I wouldn’t expect a smooth transition between December and the subsequent January that uses a different algorithm.

We have provided additional justification and show that there are no large offsets from year to year fit in a new figure:

“The MLRs to create the monthly mapped products were produced for each year such that the mapped products could be extended each year in a straightforward fashion. To determine if there were anomalous discontinuities between December and January that could impact the timeseries, the difference in between fCO$_{2w}$ for subsequent months were plotted versus time in Figure 3. No significant discontinuities were observed. Only for Jan 2009, 2010, and 2017 there appear to be a slight difference in the pattern of monthly progressions but such anomalies are observed during other times of year as well. Using an MLR that includes year as one of the coefficients (supplemental material S2 and S3) provides a slightly worse fit. More importantly, using such a fit would necessitate recalculating the mapped products every time a new year is added.”
Also, I do not see a good description of how the derived parameters pH and Omega Ar were validated.

Since Omega is calculated, and pH was not measured on the cruise there is no straightforward way to validate these products. We have emphasized that these are products and have added a section and a new Table 2 on estimated uncertainties of the products.

Minor concerns: Line 121. A Licor 6262 was used. While this is a fine instrument, it has not been production since 2005. I'm not worried about the CO2 measurements since they do a good job with standards, but how was the H2O channel calibrated or standardized? How accurate is your pH2O?

We have listed that the H2O channel was zeroed, and that water vapor concentration was very low

Section 2.4. What information do the MLD estimates convey? They mention what they could be used for e.g. inventories, but nothing about how they help the estimates. Please include your ideas on this.

We have detailed that this is a gap filling technique

Line 150. The term "bone dry" is not very scientific and should have been hyphenated. Plus, bones are not that dry. See, Timmins, P.A., Wall, J.C. Bone water. Calc. Tis Res. 23, 1–5 (1977). https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02012759.

This is a common expression in the “old” chemistry school. We have eliminated this phrase

Line 150. Mentions “analyses typically had a humidity of 10% or less”, but earlier (L. 120) mentioned that the headspace was dried >75%. I think I get the distinction, but it was confusing to me.

This was corrected. It is less than 10 %

Line 267. Mentions that cooler near surface temperatures could lead to lower fCO2 values and that this has a “large impact on the calculated air sea fluxes”. Please use a citation or constrain the “Large impact” with some stats. We added the estimate from the Wanninkhof 2019 paper.
“As shown in Wanninkhof et al. 2019b, a 0.25 °C bias in SST leads to a 2 µatm difference in fCO$_{2w}$ and a 25% change in the air-sea CO$_2$ flux” and we also provide a brief discussion in the new section on uncertainties, including two new references.

Line 273-275. Where does the steady state increase of 2.13 uatm/yr come from? Is this from the ship's atm data or is it Mauna Loa carbon tracker or something else. Also, over a 17-year time series, one would expect a changing rate of CO2atm. Is “steady state” referring to the linear increase over that time period? Clarify.

The source of atmospheric data was provided two paragraphs below line 273-275. “For the air-sea CO$_2$ fluxes, the monthly fCO$_{2a}$ values were derived from the weekly average xCO$_{2a}$ of the stations on Key Biscayne (KEY) and Ragged Point Barbados (RPB) (CarbonTracker Team, 2019; https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/flask.php).

We changed the sentence to” At steady state this atmospheric CO$_2$ increase would translate to a linear trend of fCO$_{2w}$ of 2.13 µatm yr$^{-1}$ over the time period.”

Line 324 For Boron, I though the Lee at al, 2009 algorithm was more commonly used these days. The verdict is still out. In the SOCCOM project and in Orr et al. 2018 (new reference) the use of Uppström (1974) is recommended. We left this unchanged.

Line 343. Use a reference or two for the use of Omega as a biological indicator.


Equation 9. If this is right out of CO2sys, I see no reason for an equation.

You would have to dig into the code of CO2Sys and this equation is pretty fundamental, but seldom presented, when discussing saturation states. We left this unchanged.
Figure 1. It's unfortunate that there's little data where the salinity variability is presumably the highest (i.e., in the Southern Caribbean where the large South American Rivers affect the region). What is the effect of this on the gridded data?

As shown in Wanninkhof 2019 (figures 3 and 4) and accompanying text, the salinity anomalies show up in the SE and NW part of the region. However, these variabilities in salinity have a small effect on the total area.

Acknowledgments: should mention the cruise line that made this possible.

Yes, thanks for pointing this out. We had RCCL listed in the team list but we have added the following in the acknowledgement: “This work would not have been possible without support from Royal Caribbean Cruise Lines who have provided access to their ships and significant financial, personnel, and infrastructure resources for the measurement campaign coordinated through the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences of the University of Miami.”
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The manuscript presents a dataset of surface ocean fCO2, and auxiliary variables, measured in the Caribbean from 2002-2018. In addition, a data product consisting of gridded and gap-filled maps of fCO2, pH, aragonite saturation state, and air-sea CO2 fluxes is produced and presented. Both the observational dataset and the data products are of undoubtedly high quality and will very likely be very useful to the global ocean carbonate chemistry community. The manuscript is nicely presented and illustrated, and overall well-written though at times...
highly repetitive. This work is highly relevant for publication in ESSD and can be published after minor revisions (detailed below).  

Major comments:  
Why use annual multilinear regressions? I understand from the appendix that using delta fCO2 did not improve the results, but I’d like to also see what difference it would make to use one multilinear regression where atmospheric xCO2 (or fCO2) is included as a predictor variable. Have you analyzed whether the use of annual multilinear regressions create discontinuities between December and January? Please add a figure showing that this is negligible.

This was noted by reviewer 1 as well. We have provided additional justification and show that there are no large offsets between year to year fits: “The MLRs to create the monthly mapped products were produced for each year such that the mapped products could be extended each year in a straightforward fashion. To determine if there were anomalous discontinuities between December and January that could impact the timeseries, the difference in between fCO_{2w} for subsequent months were plotted versus time in Figure 3. No significant discontinuities were observed. Only for Jan 2009, 2010, and 2017 there appear to be a slight difference in the pattern of monthly progressions but such anomalies are observed during other times of year as well. Using an MLR that includes year as one of the coefficients (supplemental material) provides a worse fit. More importantly, using such a fit would necessitate recalculating the mapped products every time a new year is added.”

I find the entire manuscript to poorly structured which results in a lot of repetition. I suggest to restructure in order to create a nicer flow of information and thus increase readability. Some suggestions, in no particular order: - The information on lines 94-104 would be better suited in
section 1.3 (instrumentation) - Information in section 1.3 (instrumentation) and sections 2.1 and 2.2 should be combined and the text screened for repetitive information (e.g., the frequency of calibration is mentioned on line 114 and again on line 122)

While we have retained the structure, we have rearranged the text and eliminated repetition as shown in the uploaded version of the manuscript using MS-Word track changes and it is more readable now.

- I’m not sure of the value of section 1.3.3 unless these data are used in the presented dataset or data products (which is unclear)

This is to indicate that this UWpCO2 system is part of a larger effort. This also points readers to a possible opportunity to utilize these observations in conjunction with UWpCO2 data and data products presented

- Section 2 could be a subsection under section 1 - Much of the information on lines 65-74 would be more appropriate in the methods (much of it is also repeated in the different methods sections) - The information on lines 270-294 would be better suited in section 3.5 - In section 4.1 you give much information which is suitable, and partly repeated, in section 5

We’ve made significant edits along the lines suggested but retained the overall structure. E.g. section 1. Is about instrumentation, section 2 is about data from the instrumentation. For readers who are more interested in the data it avoids needing to closely read the detail of the instruments themselves.

Minor comments:

Line 64: I’d prefer the term “raw data processing” over “data reduction”. While the former is commonly used in the community, it is not intuitive to those outside what it actually involves.

We are confused by this comment as it suggests that the recommended change to “raw data processing” is not intuitive. We agree with that as “raw data” is a bit ambiguous and we kept nomenclature as is.
In the introduction it is stated that the Explorer of the Seas changed her home port to Bayonne, NJ in 2008 while in section 1 it is stated that the new home port is Cape Liberty Cruise Port. I realize these may be in the same place but it is nevertheless confusing.

Thanks for pointing this out it was changed

Please revise Line 171: Explain what flag questionable is (presumably WOCE 3)

Done

Line 242: I do not understand the method. Please explain. Line 340-341: While this is correct I find it helpful to instead state that when \( \Omega_{\text{Ar}} < 1 \) dissolution is thermodynamically favored, and vice versa when \( \Omega_{\text{Ar}} > 1 \). In living organisms both dissolution and precipitation of calcium carbonate is biologically mediated, and shells have been shown to survive well in water with \( \Omega_{\text{Ar}} 0.9 \).

Based on this reviewers comments, and that of reviewer one, we have changed the text to “When \( \Omega_{\text{Ar}} \) is less than 1 dissolution is thermodynamically favored and when \( \Omega_{\text{Ar}} \) is greater than 1 aragonite would have a tendency to precipitate.”

In section 4 you should define the difference between a dataset and data products. My experience is that surprisingly many do not know the difference. It is unclear whether you consider the gridded data part of the dataset or a data product.

We’ve adopted following nomenclature [following Wanninkhof et al. 2019] and checked for consistency throughout the paper:

- **Data**: individual data points (observations)
- **Gridded data**: binned and averaged data (in this case monthly on a 1 by 1 grid)
- **Gridded data product**: a derived (calculated or interpolated) (in this case monthly on a 1 by 1 grid)
- **Mapped data (product)**: interpolated using the MLRs
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The manuscript describes a 17 year dataset for surface water marine carbonate data collected using multiple ships within the Caribbean and a substantial set of derived data.

The manuscript appears to have been a little rushed. There are instances of unclear statements, inconsistent naming, repetition, use of non-SI units, formatting errors and some structural issues. I have listed all comments referring to these issues under the section ‘Minor comments’ (See below).

These issues were also brought up by the other reviewers and we have addressed these and/or provided detail about changes (or why not) below. The issue of non-SI units is noted but we use the community accepted terms of expressing fCO2 in µatm and pressure in millibar. This is done almost exclusively in ocean carbon cycle research.

I would suggest that the manuscript is re-considered after revision and my reasoning is explained below within the Major comments.

Major comments: 1. The uncertainty information within the manuscript is inconsistent and/or incomplete. Some information is given for the fCO2 data but nothing is given for the temperature or salinity. No uncertainty information or statements are given for the derived datasets eg pH or aragonite saturation state or gas fluxes. This limited information will limit the use of these data, or could result in users making incorrect assumptions about the uncertainties. It would be good if the authors could follow a standard framework or phrasing for presenting the uncertainty information e.g. BIPM 2008 framework and identifying if
uncertainties are Type A or Type B and also identify which components of the uncertainty budget have been considered and which have been ignored. It is clear that the derived datasets are unlikely to be considered to be 'truth' measurements, so the authors need to write some text to explain this, so that users of the dataset don’t make the mistake of assuming that these data are truth. It may make sense, and/or make it easier for the reader, if all of the uncertainty information was grouped together into a common location (e.g., one table?) which can then be referred to within the different sections of the manuscript.

We appreciate the recognition of the reviewer of the importance of characterizing uncertainty that is lacking in many manuscripts covering the environmental sciences, including this one. The guide is also appreciated and read (during this time of shelter at home). We have added a section of uncertainty estimates on the data products following the nomenclature and approach outlined in Orr et al. 2018. The uncertainties in the observations using the instrumentation described and the calculated $fCO_{2w}$ have been described in Pierrot et al., 2006. While full characterization of the uncertainty in the data products is challenging, we feel that this new section is an important addition.

Lines 266 to 268. The text states that the cooler temperatures near the surface could lead to lower $fCO_2$ which can have large impact on the calculated air-sea gas fluxes. But the gas fluxes have been calculated using a version of the bulk flux calculation (equation 4) which ignores all vertical temperature gradients. However, the dataset includes OISST data which could be used to perform a more accurate gas flux calculation (e.g., re-calculate pCO2 to a common depth, then perform a more accurate calculation). The authors could either provide the results using a more accurate gas flux calculation or highlight this issue to the user/reader and then refer them to an example analysis that shows the impact of a lower accuracy gas flux calculation and
he estimate the increased uncertainty within their derived dataset that results from this lower accuracy calculation. To help, see figures 3 and figure 4 of Holding et al., (2019) for an analysis of the impact along single cruise tracks, or panel 1 of Shutler et al., (2019) for the impact over larger spatial and temporal areas.


This is a description of the mapped product using the conventional bulk flux parameterization as described. This is the same approach as in most climatologies. We are aware of the developments and claims of superior ways of determining the fluxes by normalizing to a common depth and using skin temperatures. We have added a short description in the uncertainty section and referenced two key papers addressing the cool skin effect controversy. This is mentioned in the Wanninkhof 2019 paper as well.

It’s not clear why the multi-linear regressions are performed and/or why anyone would want this output. These results and methods should introduced giving an explanation as to why they are useful. I’m not sure that this part of the dataset is needed though.

We have clarified that this is the means of mapping for gap filling.

As mentioned:” The gridded observations (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) represent about 10 % of the area of investigation from 15-28˚N and 88-62˚W over the period of investigation” so there has to be a means to fill in the missing cells. As described in Wanninkhof et al, 2019, and here the variation in each grid cell provided: “The standard deviation (stdev) of the fCO$_{2w}$ in each cell is determined and then the average of the stdev for the 9924 cells with observations is taken. The average stdev is 3.4 ± 2.6 µatm (n=9224) indicating the small variability in each cell. The same procedure is followed for SST and SSS yielding values of 0.22± 0.19 ˚C for SST; and 0.10± 0.10 for SSS. These are relatively small deviations compared to the monthly spatial range of ≈ 20 µatm for
fCO$_{2w}$: $\approx 1$ °C for SST; $\approx 1$ in SSS. The amplitude of the seasonal cycle of $\approx 40$ µatm for fCO$_{2w}$ and $\approx 4$ °C for SST is significantly greater than the average stdev as well.

2. The binning method does not account for the paired nature of the pCO2 and SST datasets (as each parameter is binned individually). Surely the binning will have skewed this relationship and so the paired nature will no longer exist. This issue may be especially true if some bins contain data from multiple cruises (which fig 1 suggests will occur). Can the authors highlight this issue and discuss the implications so that users of the dataset are aware of this problem?

We are not completely clear what the reviewer is getting at. As listed the stdev of the binned and averaged data is quite small and the analysis does not rely on the paired nature of pCO2 and SST. “The standard deviation (stdev) of the fCO$_{2w}$ in each cell is determined and then the average of the stdev for the 9924 cells with observations is taken. The average stdev is 3.4 ± 2.6 µatm (n=9224) indicating the small variability in each cell. The same procedure is followed for SST and SSS yielding values of 0.22± 0.19 °C for SST; and 0.10± 0.10 for SSS. These are relatively small deviations compared to the monthly spatial range of $\approx 20$ µatm for fCO$_{2w}$; $\approx 1$ °C for SST; $\approx 1$ in SSS. The amplitude of the seasonal cycle of $\approx 40$ µatm for fCO$_{2w}$ and $\approx 4$ °C for SST is significantly greater than the average stdev as well”

Minor comments: 1. line 30, suggest ‘The data and products could be used for de-termination of ....’ as surely the paper is providing data for others to use (rather than presenting their use of these data).

This merely provides examples of possible use.

2. the use of the word ‘average’ throughout the manuscript is ambiguous. do the authors mean a statistical mean, mode or median? (all are averages). suggest that all instances of the word ‘average’ are replaced with the appropriate statistical name.

As listed in section 4.2.1 of the BIPM, 2008 - Guide to the expression of uncertainty, “arithmetic mean or average”. When we refer to average are referring to the arithmetic mean. I am not familiar with calling mode or median an average
3. there are instances of 'month' and 'mo'. the latter I think also means 'month'. I'd suggest that the authors use one throughout, rather than swapping between both. 4.

Thanks. We only use “mo” in units and when describing the grid cell and this is mentioned the first time it is used: “For the regionally mapped products on a 1-degree grid and monthly timescale (1˚ by 1˚ by mo)”. The grid size (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) is listed a lot in part based on a reviewers request to the JGR Wanninkhof et al. 2019 paper. For clarity we have placed brackets around each occurrence of (1˚ by 1˚ by mo).

line 99, space needed between 100 and units (m).

Thanks, done

3. line 101, no dash needed in '5-m'. similarly three further instances on line 109 and more instances of this on line 191.

Thanks, corrected I am always confused when a dash is needed

4. line 126, the value of 2uatm is twice the size of the value on line 120. are these the same values ie +-1uatm? how has this value of 2uatm been estimated?

This is provided in the reference that is now added, “estimated at better than 2 µatm (Pierrot et al., 2009).” The intercomparison showing 1 uatm agreement used common standards, pressure and temperature measurements. The 2 uatm incorporates uncertainties in Teq and P as described in the provided reference.

5. line 115, I’d suggest ‘measurements for the ships with ir intakes and analysers.’ 8. line 124, can you provide the range in values used for the standards?

Added in the description of the standards “The four calibration gases supplied by the global monitoring division of the environmental science research laboratory of NOAA (GMD/ESRL/NOAA) are traceable to the WMO CO₂ mole fraction scale. The CO₂ concentrations of the standards span the range of surface water values encountered along the ship tracks (≈ 280-480 ppm).
6. section 1.3.2 the precision, accuracy and sensitivity of these instruments are missing. We have now stated that these can be found in Pierrot et al (2009). However, we do not include sensitivity.

7. line 150, use of non scientific phrasing, what is ‘bone dry’? This has been replaced. As noted, “bone dry” used to be the common terminology: “bone-dry=completely dry”

8. line 158, can you define what you mean by infrequently? eg. %age of time. Change to “Infrequently (<1 % of the time)”

9. line 160, processing routines are mentioned but no detail is given. could an overview of these processing routines be provided in the appendices? this information would appear fairly important should anyone want to use these data and/or try and follow the same methods for a similar effort somewhere else in the world. The processing routines are described in Pierrot et al. (2006) and as listed MATLAB routines are available from Pierrot on request.

10. line 266, I’d suggest ‘While both differences include zero within their uncertainty..’ Done

11. Suggest that section 3.4 (binning procedure) comes before the sections on the calculations (as surely the binning is done first, then the calculations are performed). We’ve rearranged the sections and clarified procedures. The fCO$_2$ and pCO$_2$ was calculated and then the results were binned. For the fluxes we used the binned product. So placing it before the fluxes would make sense but it does not flow as well. Added a reference to the following section “a bulk formulation is applied to the data from the gridded mapped product (see 3.4):”

12. line 303, I think that CCMP data are available for 2018 eg http://data.remss.com/ccmp/v02.0/ Yes but this was not available when the calculations were performed. These will be annual updates and when the 2019 data is included the winds will be updated
13. line 327, see 'were compared for 201'. what is 201?
Corrected to 2017

14. line 336, 'insignificant' is a bit subjective and application specific. can you put this into context?
We have changed this and included it in the discussion of uncertainty

'This MLR was then applied to the independent variables for each grid box to determine pH(MLR). This was compared to the approach used here of calculating the pH using the mapped fCO2wMLR and TA-SSS relationships on (1° x 1° x mo) grids, called pH(fCO2w,TA). The two approaches provided similar results with pH(fCO2w,TA) - pH(MLR) = -0.0001 ± 0.005 for 2017. The small difference showed a pattern with SST (Fig. 6) but not with the other independent variables. The differences using either pH(fCO2w,TA) or pH,MLR are an order of magnitude smaller than the combined standard uncertainties such that the approach of using mapped fCO2w and TA to determine pH(MLR) yielded precise and consistent gridded pH.'

15. table 3, space needed between 12 and (December).
done

16. table 3, 4, and 5 all contain non-SI unit notation in pH row (mol/kg-SW)
unclear pH is unitless as indicated

17. line 407, the 'stdev' has previously been used, but not defined.
Defined in section 3.4: "The standard deviation (stdev) of"

18. the content in section 4.5 is a bit jumbled. The method for the annual and monthly values needs to be more clearly and sequentially explained. Eg surely the values are first weighted by area and then summed (rather than summed and the mean value area weighted?).
Thanks. This section has been rewritten

19. line 411 to 414. Can you clarify this paragraph? I'm afraid that I don't really understand this paragraph or the reasoning and why are the data treated differently?
Thanks. This section has been rewritten

20. line 409, the dash between terra and grams is not needed.
Done

21. section 5 contains repetition (with section 4.1).
The data availability section is a requirement for ESSD and it also must appear in the main text.
22. line 445, I’d suggest ‘..instrumental in maintaining the science operations.’
   Done

23. line 667, month/year notation is different from the main paper.
   We’ve made it consistent

24. line 676, how is this ‘overall uncertainty’ determined?
   Changed to combined Standard uncertainty in the fCO$_{2w,MLR}$ as per Orr et al, 2018

25. line 677, mixing of ‘errors’ and ‘uncertainties’ naming. I think that they are all uncertainties
   (error implies that you know a truth value). What is the ‘error’ column in table 1? and it
   appears to be called RMSE in table A1 and A2.
   We have defined the abbreviations in the footnote. Error is standard error

26. line 683, Lat and Lon not defined.
   Corrected and changed LAT and LON in tables to Lat and Lon

27. line 684, RMS not defined.
   Corrected
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Abstract. A high-quality dataset of surface water partial pressure/fugacity of CO\(_2\) (pCO\(_{2w}\)/fCO\(_{2w}\))\(^1\), comprised of over a million observations, and derived products are presented for the Northern Sea covering the timespan from 2002 through 2018. Prior to installation of automated pCO\(_2\) systems on cruise ships of the Royal Caribbean Cruise Lines and subsidiaries, very limited surface water carbon data were available in this region. With this observational program, the Northern Caribbean Sea has now become one of the best sampled regions for pCO\(_2\) of the world's ocean. The dataset, and derived quantities are binned and averaged on a 1-degree monthly grid and available at http://accession.nodc.noaa.gov/0207749, DOI:10.25921/2swk-9w56 (Wanninkhof et al., 2019a). The derived quantities include total alkalinity (TA), acidity (pH), Aragonite saturation state (Ω\(_{Ar}\)) and air-sea CO\(_2\) flux, and cover the region from 15° N to 28° N and 88° W to 62° W. The gridded data and products are used for determination of status and trends of ocean acidification, for quantifying air-sea CO\(_2\) fluxes, and for ground truthing models. Methodologies to derive the TA, pH and Ω\(_{Ar}\), and to calculate the fluxes from fCO\(_{2w}\) temperature and salinity are described.

Introduction

Over the past 20 years a rapidly expanding program of measurements of surface water partial pressure of carbon dioxide (pCO\(_{2w}\)) or the fugacity of CO\(_2\) (fCO\(_{2w}\)) has provided data to determine air-sea CO\(_2\) fluxes and rates of ocean acidification on local to global scales (e.g. Boutin et al., 2008; Degrandpre et al., 2002; Evans et al. 2015; Schuster et al., 2012; Takahashi et al., 2014; Wanninkhof et al. 2019a, b). Marginal seas, that historically had a dearth of measurements, have been targeted for increased observations. Through an industry, academic, and federal partnership between the U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Royal Caribbean Cruise Lines (RCCL), and the University of Miami, cruise ships were outfitted with automated surface water pCO\(_2\) systems, also called underway pCO\(_2\) systems (Pierrot et al., 2009). In 2002, the RCCL ship Explorer of the Seas (EoS) was equipped with an underway pCO\(_2\) setup providing observations on alternating weekly transects from Miami, FL to the Northeastern and Northwestern Caribbean. In 2015, the EoS was repositioned out of the Atlantic and the Celebrity Equinox (Eqnx) was outfitted with an underway pCO\(_2\) system. Additionally, an underway pCO\(_2\) system was installed on the Allure of the Seas (ALos) in 2016. The Eqnx and ALos covered similar transects as the EoS but on more irregular and seasonal basis. A total of 582 cruises covered the region from 2002 through 2018. A map of all cruise tracks is shown in Figure 1. The number of cruises per year covering the Caribbean Sea and adjacent Western Atlantic are provided in Figure 2. There are fewer cruises in the middle part of the record when the EoS was diverted to other routes outside the area, and eventually repositioned.

\(^1\) fCO\(_2\) is the pCO\(_2\) corrected for the non-ideal behavior of CO\(_2\) (Weiss 1974). In surface water fCO\(_{2w}\) = 0.997 pCO\(_{2w}\)
The surface water $pCO_2$ observational dataset and derived products including total alkalinity (TA), acidity (pH), aragonite saturation state ($\Omega_{Ar}$), and air-sea $CO_2$ flux are of importance for determining the anthropogenic carbon uptake, and to assess trends and impacts of ocean acidification. The observational data are provided to the global surface ocean carbon atlas (SOCAT) (Bakker et al., 2016) and global $CO_2$ climatology (Takahashi et al., 2009; 2018). These data are the main source of $fCO_2$ observations available in the region, and the high frequency of measurements provides a seasonally resolved picture of changing $fCO_2$. This effort has made the Northern Caribbean one of the few places in the world's ocean where such regional observational density has been established. The data and mapped products are interpreted in Wanninkhof et al. (2019b) who show large decadal changes in trends of surface water $fCO_2$ and associated changes in air-sea $CO_2$ fluxes.

The data from the first part of this record form the basis of the Caribbean ocean acidification product suite that maps ocean acidification conditions in the Caribbean (Gledhill et al., 2008; https://www.coral.noaa.gov/accrete/oaps.html; https://cwcgom.aoml.noaa.gov/erddap/griddap/miamiacidification.graph). The large, high quality, and well-resolved dataset is also used to validate models (Gomez et al., 2020).

For optimal application, datasets and associated data products are fully documented here, and are readily accessible according to the findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable (FAIR) principles (Wilkinson et al., 2016). The documentation of the cruises, the sampling methodology, and data reduction techniques are presented in brief. This is followed by a description of the approaches to calculate the different inorganic carbon system parameters. The procedure is to bin and average the $fCO_{2w}$ on a 1˚ by 1˚ grid on monthly scales, referred to as gridded observations. Then the so-called second inorganic carbon system parameter is calculated that is used in conjunction with $fCO_{2w}$. We estimate the total alkalinity (TA) based on robust relationships of TA with salinity (Cai et al., 2010; Takahashi et al., 2014; Lee et al., 2006; Millero et al., 1998), and use a software program CO2SYS (Pierrot et al., 2006) to calculate the other inorganic carbon system parameters of interest, in this case pH and $\Omega_{Ar}$. These data products are presented at monthly scales binned and averaged on a 1˚ by 1˚ grid, referred to as gridded products. Annual multi-linear regressions (MLR) are developed between the gridded $fCO_{2w}$ data, and sea surface temperature (SST), sea surface salinity (SSS), location (latitude (Lat) and longitude (Lon)), and mixed layer depth as independent variables. These regressions are applied at monthly and 1˚ by 1˚ spatial resolution to the region between 15˚ N and 28˚ N, and 88˚ W and 62˚ W using remotely sensed or modeled independent variables, and used to calculated air-sea $CO_2$ fluxes. These calculated parameters are called gridded mapped products. The procedures and datasets, including an uncertainty analyses, and tables of column headers of the product created are provided below.

### Observations

The observational program is described in terms of the ships, voyages, and instrumentation. The ships predominantly sailed in the Caribbean Sea, but also had tracks outside the region, including in the Northeast of the USA, to Bermuda and in the Mediterranean. The description of operations, data, and products presented here cover the Northern Caribbean Sea and...
The Explorer of the Seas (EoS) changed homeport from Miami, FL to Cape Liberty Cruise Port, NJ in 2008, and changed its routes at that point to include cruises with Bermuda as a port of call. In 2015 the EoS was repositioned to the Pacific and the underway pCO$_2$ system was removed. From 2015 onward the Celebrity Equinox (Eqnx) and from 2016 onward the Allure of the Seas (ALos) covered the area. The Eqnx spent the summers of 2015 and 2016 in the Mediterranean, causing seasonal data gaps in the Caribbean.

1.2 Cruises

The EoS had 331 cruises from 2002 to 2015; the Eqnx completed 135 cruises from 2015 through 2018; and the ALos performed 116 cruises in the study area from 2016 through 2018. Temporal coverage over the 17 years shows at least bi-weekly occupations at the beginning of the record from 2002 to 2007, and at the end from 2014 through 2018, with fewer occupations in the years in between (Fig. 2). The cruises lasted between 7 and 14 days, and made about a half a dozen ports of call. The ships generally were in port from early morning to late afternoon, and transited between ports at night, except for long runs (e.g., from Miami to San Juan) when the ship sailed continuously for several days. Ports are listed in the metadata accompanying the original data.

The systems were installed in different locations for the three ships, but each had a dedicated seawater intake near the bow. The EoS had an intake in the bow thruster tube (≈3 m depth) that was non-optimal due to bubble entrainment during bow thruster operations and heavy seas. These observations have been culled from the datasets. The ALos and Eqnx had their intake at ≈5 m depth, but forward of the bow thruster and had fewer issues with bubble entrainment. On the EoS, the underway pCO$_2$ instrument was initially in a dedicated science laboratory built for purpose on the ship, and located amidships about 100 m from the intake. In 2008, a new system was placed in the engineering space closer to the bow with no apparent change in performance. For the ALos and Eqnx, the instruments were near the bow intake in the engineering space, about 5 m from the intake. The EoS had an air intake mounted on a mast at the forward most point of the main deck in August of 2008. The Eqnx had an air intake near the bow one level below the main deck since the initial installation in March 2015. The underway pCO$_2$ systems on these ships made marine boundary layer (MBL) air observations (xCO$_2$) as described in Wanninkhof 2019b but these are not used in the data products presented. Typical cruise speeds were 22 knots which, with sampling every 2.5 minutes, yielded a fCO$_2$ sample approximately every 1.7 km except for 35 minutes every 4.5 hours when four calibration gases, and a CO$_2$-free reference gas were analyzed, followed by 5 atmospheric CO$_2$ measurements for the ships with air intakes. This created a gap of 24 km (≈1/4˚) without fCO$_2$ measurements.
1.3 Instrumentation

1.3.1 pCO

The instrumentation is based on a community design described in Pierrot et al. (2009). The instruments were manufactured by General Oceanics Inc. and have performed to high accuracy specifications (Wanninkhof, 2013). The surface water drawn from the intake at about 4.1 min\(^{-1}\) went through a 1.1 l sprayhead equilibrator with a water volume of 0.5 l and a headspace of 0.6 l. The spray and agitation caused the CO\(_2\) in the headspace to equilibrate with the CO\(_2\) in water with a response time of about 2 minutes (Pierrot et al., 2009; Web et al., 2016). Thus, the air in the headspace reached 99.8 % equilibration in 12 minutes. As the air is recirculated and surface waters were relatively homogeneous on hourly timescales, 100.0 % equilibration was assumed. The four calibration gases supplied by the global monitoring division of the environmental science research laboratory of NOAA (GMD/ESRL/NOAA) were traceable to the WMO CO\(_2\) mole fraction scale. The CO\(_2\) concentrations of the standards spanned the range of surface water values encountered along the ship tracks (≈ 280- 480 ppm).

The gas entering the analyzer was dried by passing it through a thermo-electric cooler at 5˚ C and a PermaPure drier. The standards did not contain water vapor. The air and equilibrator headspace analyses typically had about 10 % or less humidity. Every 27 hours the CO\(_2\) of LICOR model 6262 infrared analyzer were zeroed with the dry CO\(_2\)-free air and spanned with the highest standard. The CO\(_2\) mole fraction was zeroed with the dry CO\(_2\)-free air but not spanned. The dry mole fraction of CO\(_2\) (xCO\(_2\) in parts per million, ppm), as calculated and output by the analyzer based on measured CO\(_2\) and water vapor levels, were recorded. The systems were automatically turned off when the ships entered port, and upon shutdown they were back-flushed with fresh water removing particles from the inline water filter thereby alleviating clogging issues in the filter and reducing biofouling of water lines, filter and equilibrator.

Data from the ALos and Eqnx were transmitted to shore updated daily and displayed online in graphical format at https://www.aoml.noaa.gov/ocd/ocdweb/allure/allure_realtime.html and https://www.aoml.noaa.gov/ocd/ocdweb/equinox/equinox_realtime.html, respectively. These updates provided a near-real time opportunity to look at the response of surface water CO\(_2\) to episodic events, such as passage of hurricanes, and yielded timely indications of instrument malfunction that could be remedied when the ships returned to port. The instruments have shown agreement to within 1 µatm with other state-of-art systems in intercomparison studies (Nojiri et al., Feb. 2009 pers. com.). Several different versions of the instrument have been deployed on the ships over the years but overall measurement principles and accuracies, estimated at better than 2 µatm (Pierrot et al., 2009; Wanninkhof et al., 2013), were maintained.
1.3.2 Thermosalinograph

Temperature and salinity were measured with a flow-through Seabird SBE45 thermosalinograph (TSG) that was in a seawater flow line parallel to the pCO$_2$ equilibrator. A SBE38 remote temperature probe was situated near the inlet before the pump, and was used as the SST measurement. The TSGs and temperature probes were maintained by collaborators from the Marine Technical group at the Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences at the University of Miami (RSMAS/U. Miami). The TSGs on the ships were factory calibrated on an annual basis. Post-calibrations showed no drift in the temperature sensor but occasionally some drift in the conductivity.

1.3.3 Other instrumentation

The underway effort is part of a larger scientific operation lead by RSMAS called Oceanscope (https://oceanscope.rsmas.miami.edu/). Additional instrumentation onboard the ships include the Marine-Atmospheric Emitted Radiance Interferometer (M-AERI) to assess surface skin temperature retrievals from a number of radiometers on earth-observation satellites (Minnet et al., 2001). The M-AERI’s are Fourier-Transform Infrared interferometers situated on the deck viewing the sea surface away from the wake. Acoustic Doppler Current Profilers (ADCP) mounted on the hull of the ships are used to measure ocean currents.

2 Datasets

2.1 pCO$_2$ data

Full details on data acquisition with these systems and calculation of pCO$_2$ and fCO$_2$ can be found in Pierrot et al. (2009). Post-cruise, the xCO$_2$ data were processed by first linearly interpolating each standard measured every ~4 hours to the time of a sample measurement and then recalculating the air and water xCO$_2$ values based on the linear regression of the interpolated standard values at the time of sample measurement. For 3 cruises, the analyzer output showed negative water vapor values due to the condition of desiccant chemicals, and thus yielded erroneous dry xCO$_2$ values. Separate processing routines were developed to correct for these situations (available on request from D. Pierrot). The post-cruise corrected xCO$_2$ values were used for calculation of pCO$_2$ and fCO$_2$ as described in the calculation section.

2.2 Thermosalinograph, sea surface temperature and salinity data

The SST data were obtained from a temperature probe (Seabird, model SBE38) near the intake. The salinity was determined with a thermosalinograph (Seabird, model SBE45), from the measured conductivity and temperature in the unit using the internal software of the SBE45. The SST and SSS data were appended to the pCO$_2$ data records in real time and also logged...
via another shipboard computer at more frequent intervals. The SSS data was not quality controlled and no corrections to the SSS data were made, other than removal of spikes and values that were out of range (<5 and > 40). As salinity has minimal effect on the calculated fCO₂, bad or missing salinities were removed and substituted by linearly interpolated values to eliminate gaps. When SST were not recorded in the CO₂ files, or in error, the SST gaps were filled from the high resolution SST data files maintained by the RSMAS Oceanscope project. On the rare occasion (≈<0.1 %) that SST was not recorded at all, SST data was estimated from the equilibrator temperature data (Tₑq) after applying a constant offset between Tₑq and SST.

For the regionally mapped products on a 1-degree grid and monthly timescale (1˚ by 1˚ by mo), SST and SSS were obtained from the following sources: The SSS data were from a numerical model, the Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM) (https://HYCOM.org/) and referred to as SSSHYCOM. The SST product for the region is the Optimum Interpolated SST, OISST from https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/ (Reynolds et al., 2007). It uses data from ships, buoys and satellites to generate the fields. For the OISST the reference SST is from buoys, and the other SST data obtained from ships and other platforms were adjusted to the buoy data by subtracting 0.14˚C in the OISST product (Reynolds et al., 2007).

2.3 Wind speed data

Winds were measured on the ships but these data are not used as they are not synoptic for the whole region which is a requirement for the regional flux maps. Instead, wind speeds were obtained from the updated cross-calibrated multi-platform wind product (CCMP-2) (Atlas et al., 2011). The mean scalar neutral wind at 10 m height \( \langle u_{10} \rangle \), and its second moment \( \langle u_{10}^2 \rangle \) were used to calculate the fluxes. They were determined from the ¼ degree, 6-hourly product that was obtained from Remote Sensing Systems (RSS) (www.remss.com). This product relies heavily on the European Center for Median Weather Forecasting (ECMWF) assimilation scheme that uses in situ and remotely sensed assets, particularly (passive) radiometers on satellites. The directional component uses scatterometer data. The ¼ degree, 6-hourly CCMP-2 product was binned and averaged in 1-degree grid boxes on monthly scales (1˚ by 1˚ by mo). In absence of CCMP-2 data for 2018, the wind product from European Reanalysis, ERA5, was used (https://www.ecmwf.int/en/forecasts/datasets/reanalysis-datasets/era5, Copernicus Climate Change Service, 2017). The ERA5 wind data are at 31-km and 3-hourly resolution but were binned and averaged in the same manner as the CCMP-2 winds. There were no apparent biases between the scalar winds for the two products in the Caribbean.

2.4 Mixed layer depth data

No MLD determinations were made on the cruises and limited observational estimates from other sources are available. The MLDs provided here are from the same numerical model (HYCOM) as used for the mapped SSS, and obtained from...
http://www.science.oregonstate.edu/ocean.productivity/index.php. The MLDs are based on a density contrast of 0.03 between surface and subsurface. Mixed layer depths (MLD) are used as an independent variable in the MLRs to map the fCO$_{2w}$ values. They are also needed if mixed layer dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) inventories are desired, and to determine the effect of mixed layer depth on the changes in fCO$_{2w}$. As shown in Wanninkhof (2019b, Figure 9), MLDs are negatively correlated with fCO$_{2w}$. They are provided in the gridded mapped product.

3 Calculations

The calculations of the concentrations and fluxes follow standard procedures as described below. The mapping procedures are detailed. The section on uncertainty includes an example of different possible means of mapping and the effect on the final product.

3.1 Calculation of pCO$_2$

The starting point in the calculations, which were aided by use of MATLAB routines following the procedures as in Pierrot et al. (2009), were calibrated (dry) xCO$_2$.

The xCO$_2$ values were converted to pCO$_{2eq}$ (µatm) values:

$$pCO_{2eq} = xCO_{2eq}(P_{eq}-pH_2O)$$

(1)

where eq refers to equilibrator conditions. The $P_{eq}$ is the pressure in the equilibrator headspace and $pH_2O$ is the water vapor pressure calculated according to Eq. 10 in Weiss and Price (1980). The pCO$_{2eq}$ was corrected to surface water values using the intake temperature (SST) and the temperature of water in the equilibrator ($T_{eq}$) according to the empirical relationship that Takahashi et al. (1993) developed for North Atlantic surface waters:

$$pCO_{2w} = pCO_{2eq}e^{(0.0423(SST-T_{eq}))}$$

(2)

This empirical correction for temperature is widely used but it is of note that applying the thermodynamic relationships for carbonate dissociation constants yields different temperature dependencies that are a function of temperature. For average SST in the Caribbean of 27.0 °C the coefficient of temperature dependence varies from 0.036 to 0.040 using commonly used constants as provided in inorganic carbon system programs such as CO2SYS (Pierrot et al, 2006) compared to the coefficient of 0.0423 (or 4.23 % °C$^{-1}$) used above. On average the difference between SST and $T_{eq}$ is 0.12 °C for all the cruises such that the correction from $T_{eq}$ to SST using the coefficient of 0.0423 in Eq. 2 is 1.9 µatm under average conditions of SST= 27 °C, and fCO$_{2w} =$374 µatm. Using a temperature coefficient of 0.036 the temperature correction would be 1.6 µatm, or a 0.3 µatm difference.

3.2 Calculation of fCO$_2$ in air and water

The fCO$_2$ is the pCO$_2$ corrected for non-ideality of CO$_2$ solubility in water using the virial equation of state (Weiss, 1974). The correction can be expressed as:

$$fCO_{2a,w} = e^{(SST,P)}pCO_{2a,w}$$
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and:
\[ g(T,P) = \left( -1636.75 + 12.0408T - 0.0327957T^2 + 0.0000316528T^3 \right) \times \left( 2(1-xCO_2 \times 10^9) \right) \times \left( 57.7 - 0.118T \right) \]
\[ (P/1013.25)/(82.0575T) \]
(3)

where \( T \) is in Kelvin, \( xCO_2 \) in is ppm, and \( P \) is in mbar.

Under average conditions in the Caribbean, the function \( g^{(SST,P)} \approx 0.997 \) and \( fCO_{2w} \) will be \( \approx 1.2 \) µatm less than \( pCO_{2w} \). As the corrections from partial pressure to fugacity in air and water are approximately the same, the difference between \( \Delta pCO_2 (=pCO_2-pCO_2w) \) and \( \Delta fCO_2 (=fCO_2-fCO_2w) \), that were used to determine the fluxes (Eq. 5), is negligible \((\approx 0.1 \text{ µatm})\).

### 3.3 Gridding procedure

Gridding of the observations of \( fCO_{2w} \), SST, and SSS was performed by binning and averaging the data in (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) cells. At typical ship speeds of 22 knots, the ship covered 1˚ in about 2.5 hours taking 60 measurements. This would yield about 250 measurements per month assuming weekly cruises through the area. The actual number of measurements per grid cell ranged from 8 to 500. The higher number of observations per cell were mostly in the latter part of the record, when the average of the sum of squares of the wind speeds reported in CCMP-2 will vary from 1.1 to 3.5 grid resolution. The number of wind speed observation in a 1˚ by 1˚ by mo grid is 1920. This sample density captures the frequency spectrum of winds except that extreme wind events such as hurricanes are not fully represented due to the local nature of the extremes and inherent smoothing in the CCMP-2 product. The \( Sc \) is the Schmidt number of CO in seawater, defined as the kinematic viscosity of seawater divided by the molecular diffusion coefficient of CO. It is determined as a function of temperature from Wanninkhof (2014). At the average temperature of 27˚C the \( Sc_{CO2} \) equals 475. Over the typical range of SST in the Caribbean from 24˚C to 30˚C, the \( Sc_{CO2} \) will vary from 1.1 to 1.27, indicating that the gas transfer velocity will be 27% higher at an SST of 30˚C compared to a SST of 20˚C that would correspond to a \( Sc \) of 660.

### 3.4 Mapping procedures for \( fCO_{2w} \) and fluxes

#### 3.4.1 Mapping \( fCO_{2w} \) using a multi-linear regression

The gridded observations (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) were used to determine the fluxes (Eq. 4), for the determination of the air-sea CO\(_2\) flux (\( F_{CO2} \), mol m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)), a bulk formulation is applied to the data from the gridded mapped product:

\[ F_{CO2} = \frac{\Delta fCO_2}{k} \]

where \( \Delta fCO_2 \) is \((fCO_2-fCO_2w)\), \( k \) is the gas transfer velocity parameterized as a function of wind speed (Wanninkhof, 2014), and \( k = 0.251 \times \langle u^2 \rangle^{1/2} \times (Sc_{CO2})^{1/2} \times 10^{-3} \text{µatm yr}^{-1} \text{m}^{-1} \text{m}^{-1/2} \).

### 3.3 Calculation of fluxes

For the determination of the air-sea CO\(_2\) flux (\( F_{CO2} \), mol m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)), a bulk formulation is applied to the data from the gridded mapped product:

\[ F_{CO2} = \frac{\Delta fCO_2}{k} \]

where \( \Delta fCO_2 \) is \((fCO_2-fCO_2w)\), \( k \) is the gas transfer velocity parameterized as a function of wind speed (Wanninkhof, 2014), and \( k = 0.251 \times \langle u^2 \rangle^{1/2} \times (Sc_{CO2})^{1/2} \times 10^{-3} \text{µatm yr}^{-1} \text{m}^{-1} \text{m}^{-1/2} \).

where \( u^2 \) is the monthly 2nd moment of the wind speeds reported in CCMP-2. The 2nd moment accounts for the impact of variability of the wind speed on \( k \). It is determined by taking the monthly average of the sum of squares of the wind speed in CCMP-2 provided at 6-hours and 1/3 grid resolution. The number of wind speed observation in a 1˚ by 1˚ by mo grid is 1920. This sample density captures the frequency spectrum of winds except that extreme wind events such as hurricanes are not fully represented due to the local nature of the extremes and inherent smoothing in the CCMP-2 product.
The annual MLRs were created of the form:

\[
\text{fCO}_{2w} = a \text{Lon} + b \text{Lat} + c \text{OISST} + d \text{MLD}_{\text{Hycom}} + e \text{SSS}_{\text{Hycom}} + f
\]

with the coefficients for each year, along with the standard error in \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) and standard error in each of the coefficients provided in Table 1. The standard error in the \( \text{fCO}_{2w,\text{MLR}} \) ranged from 5 to 9 µatm for each year. Using the locations, OISST (the optimal interpolated SST product), MLD\text{Hycom} and the SSS\text{Hycom} (output of the HYCOM model) the \( \text{fCO}_{2w,\text{MLR}} \) is determined for each grid cell. There were significant cross-correlations between independent variables such that the effect of the, often significant, year-to-year differences in coefficients were difficult to interpret. However, the \( \text{fCO}_{2w,\text{MLR}} \) from the annual MLRs faithfully reproduced the trends and variability.

The MLRs were produced for each year such that the mapped products could be extended for future years in a straightforward fashion. To determine if there were anomalous discontinuities between subsequent annual MLRs that could impact the time series, the difference in between \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) for subsequent months were plotted versus time in Figure 3. No significant discontinuities were observed between December and January. Only for December and January 2008/2009, 2009/2010, and 2016/2017 there appear to be slight differences in the pattern of monthly progressions but such anomalies are observed during other times of year as well. Using an MLR that includes year as one of the coefficients (supplemental material S2 and S3) provides a slightly worse fit. Moreover, using such a fit would necessitate recalculating the mapped products every time a new year is added.

As illustration of differences between gridded and mapped products the results of the \( \text{fCO}_{2w,\text{MLR}} \) calculated with the MLRs for 2004, 2011, and 2017 (Table 1) are plotted in Figure 4a along with the gridded observations for the grid cells that span the longitude range from 88’W to 62’W between 23’N and 24’N (see Figure 1). Figure 4a shows that the mapped product using annual MLRs show the increases in \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) over time in the region, and consistent differences in patterns between the East and the West for the three years. The mapped product showed a reasonable correspondence with the gridded observations. Some of the differences between the gridded observations and mapped product were caused by the mismatch between SST and SSS \textit{in situ} with the OISST and SSS\textit{HyCOM} (Figures 3b and 3c). In particular, the strong minima in OISST at 79˚ W were likely due to the OISST capturing the lower SST near the coast of Cuba. This caused the \( \text{fCO}_{2w,\text{MLR}} \) product to be lower as well, as shown in Figure 4a. It illustrates that the mapped \( \text{fCO}_{2w,\text{MLR}} \) product is both influenced by the annual MLR, and the gridded MLD\text{Hycom}, OISST, and SSS\text{Hycom}.

Table 1. The error in the calculated \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) and uncertainties in each of the coefficients are shown in Table 1. The error in the calculated \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) ranges from 5 to 9 µatm.

The strongest dependence was with SST. The coefficients for each year, along with the error in \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) and uncertainties in each of the coefficients are shown in Table 1. The error in the calculated \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) ranges from 5 to 9 µatm. As illustration, the results of the MLRs for 2004, 2011, and 2017 (Table 1) were applied to the January data in 2004, 2011, and 2017 and are plotted in Figure 3a along with the observations (if available) for the grid boxes that span the longitude range from 88˚W to 62˚W between 23˚N and 24˚N (see Figure 1). Figure 3a shows that the mapped product using annual MLRs reflected the increases in \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) in the region, and consistent differences in patterns between the East and the West for the three years. The mapped product showed a reasonable correspondence with the gridded observations. Some of the deviations between the gridded observations and mapped product were caused by the mismatch between SST and SSS \textit{in situ} with the OISST and SSS\textit{HyCOM} (Figures 3b and 3c). In particular, the strong minima in OISST at 79˚W were likely due to the OISST capturing the lower SST near the coast of Cuba. This caused the mapped \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) product to be lower as well, as shown in Figure 3a. It illustrates that the gridded \( \text{fCO}_{2w} \) product is both influenced by the annual MLR, and the MLD, SST, and SSS products used for mapping.
3.4.2 Determining the air-sea CO$_2$ fluxes for the region

For the determination of the air-sea CO$_2$ flux ($F_{CO2}$, mol m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$), a bulk formulation was applied using the gridded mapped product:

$$F_{CO2} = k K_0 \Delta fCO_2$$

(5)

where $\Delta fCO_2$ is $(fCO_2w-fCO_2a)$, $K_0$ is the seawater CO$_2$ solubility that is a function of temperature and salinity (Weiss and Price, 1980), and $k$ is the gas transfer velocity parameterized as a function of wind speed (Wanninkhof, 2014):

$$k = 0.251 <u_{10}^2> (Sc/660)^{-1/2}$$

(6)

where $<u_{10}^2>$ is the monthly 2nd moment of the wind speeds reported in CCMP-2. The 2nd moment accounts for the impact of variability of the wind speed on $k$. It is determined by taking the monthly average of the sum of squares of the wind speed in CCMP-2 provided at 6-hours and ¼˚ grid resolution. The number of wind speed observation in a (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) grid is 1920. This sample density captures the frequency spectrum of winds in the grid boxes except that extreme wind events such as hurricanes are not fully represented due to the local nature of the extremes and inherent smoothing in the CCMP-2 product. The $Sc$ is the Schmidt number of CO$_2$ in seawater, defined as the kinematic viscosity of seawater divided by the molecular diffusion coefficient of CO$_2$. It is determined as a function of temperature from Wanninkhof (2014). At the average temperature of 27 ˚C the $Sc$ equals 475. Over the typical range of SST in the Caribbean from 24 ˚C to 30 ˚C, the $(Sc/660)^{-1/2}$ will vary from 1.1 to 1.27, indicating that the gas transfer velocity will be 27 % higher at an SST of 30 ˚C compared to a SST of 20 ˚C that would correspond to a Sc of 660.

The annual $fCO_{2w,MLR}$ and modeled and remote sensed products, OISST, MLDHYCOM, SSSHYCOM, were determined for all (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) grid cells. The monthly $fCO_{2w,MLR}$ values were derived from the weekly average $xCO_{2w,MLR}$ of the stations on Key Biscayne (KEY) and Ragged Point Barbados (RPB) (CarbonTracker Team, 2019; https://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/flask.php). The second moments of the scalar winds, $<u^2>$ from CCMP-2 were averaged on the same grids. As no CCMP-2 product was available in 2018, the ERA5 wind product was used for the last year of the record.

### Table 1. Coefficients for the MLR for each year *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a (LON)</th>
<th>b (LAT)</th>
<th>c (SST)</th>
<th>d (MLD)</th>
<th>e (SSS)</th>
<th>f (Icept)</th>
<th>Standard error $fCO_{2w,MLR}$</th>
<th>$r^2$</th>
<th>#points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-55.4</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>-172.0</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>-26.6</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>-77.8</td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>10.58</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>-55.8</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>131.9</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-10.5</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>7.19</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>-154.1</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>-137.5</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>-45.2</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>-62.7</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>-112.6</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>-151.2</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.5 Gridded and mapped products for Alkalinity and pH

Total Alkalinity (TA) was determined from salinity. For estimation of TA several algorithms have been developed with salinity (Fig. 5) (Millero et al., 1998; Lee et al., 2006; Takahashi et al., 2014 and Cai et al., 2010). The relationship of Cai et al. 2010, TA= 57.3SSS+ 296.4, stdev = 5.5 was used as this was determined from observations that are similar to the conditions in the Caribbean.

The pH$_{T}$, the pH on the Total scale at SST, was subsequently determined from the calculated TA and fCO$_{2w}$. For the gridded products the gridded SST and SSS were used to determined TA. For the pH$_{T}$ the gridded TA and fCO$_{2w}$ were used. For the mapped products the gridded OISST and SSS$_{tdev}$ were applied in the calculations. The pH$_{T}$ was calculated using the program CO2SYS for Excel V2.2 (Pierrot et al., 2006) with the apparent CO$_2$ dissociation constants, K$_i$, K$_f$ from Lueker et al. (2000); the KSO$_4$ dissociation constants from Dickson (1990); thr KF dissociation constants from Perez and Fraga (1987); and the total boron relationship with salinity from Uppström (1974).

3.6 Aragonite saturation state (Ω$_{Ar}$)

The aragonite saturation state (Ω$_{Ar}$) indicates the level of supersaturation or undersaturation of seawater with respect to the mineral aragonite, a polymorph of calcium carbonate, and part of the skeletal structure of many marine calcifiers. That is, when Ω$_{Ar}$ is less than 1 aragonite dissolution is thermodynamically favored and when Ω$_{Ar}$ is greater than 1 it has a tendency to precipitate. It is used as an indicator of ecosystem health with regards to ocean acidification (Mollica et al., 2018). In warm tropical regions surface water saturation states are well above one but no active precipitation takes place except under unusual circumstances in shallow waters, in a precipitation process called whitings (Purkis et al., 2017). The Ω$_{Ar}$ is not measured directly and is defined as the product of calcium and carbonate ion concentrations divided by the solubility product of aragonite:

$$\Omega_{Ar} = [Ca^{2+}] [CO_3^{2-}] (K_{sp,Ar})^{-1}$$

where [Ca$^{2+}$] is the total calcium concentration and is derived from salinity: [Ca$^{2+}$] = 0.02128 / 40.087 * (SSS/ 1.80655) = 293.34 S in mol/kg-SW (Riley and Tongudai, 1967). [CO$_3^{2-}$] is the total carbonate ion concentration determined from two of the inorganic carbon system parameters, and K$_{sp,Ar}$ is the apparent solubility product of aragonite in seawater at a specified
salinity, temperature and pressure. In this work \([\text{CO}_3^{2-}]\) was determined from the gridded \(\text{fCO}_{2w}\) and calculated \(\text{TA}\) using the CO2SYS program. For surface waters, \(K_{\text{sp}}\) is

\[
pK_{\text{sp}} = -171.945 - 0.077993 T + 2903.293/T + 71.595 \log(T) + (-0.068393 + 0.0017276 T + 88.135/T)^{0.5} - 0.10018 S + 0.0059415 S^{1.5}
\]

Where \(pK_{\text{sp}} = -\log K_{\text{sp}}\), \(T\) is temperature in Kelvin (K), and \(S\) is salinity (Mucci, 1983). As with \(\text{pH}\), the \(\Omega_{\text{sp}}\) gridded product was determined from the gridded (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) values of SSS, SST, \(\text{fCO}_{2w}\) and \(\text{TA}\) while the mapped product uses SSS\text{Hycom}, OISST, \(\text{fCO}_{2w}\text{MLR}\) and \(\text{TA}\).

### 3.7 Uncertainty of observations, gridded and mapped products

The uncertainty of the products is difficult to quantify due to the many factors, calculations, and interpolations influencing the overall uncertainty. Moreover, the uncertainty estimate includes a random and a systematic component. The latter can have a large influence on interpretations, particularly on the calculated air-sea \(\text{CO}_2\) fluxes. Below we address the uncertainty in terms of standard errors in the observations; in the gridded products; and in the mapped products. For the calculated quantities and nomenclature we follow the approach in Orr et al. (2018). The standard uncertainty is characterized by its standard deviation/error of the measured quantities and the standard uncertainties of the input variables. The propagated uncertainty of a calculated variable is called the combined standard uncertainty. Error propagation for addition is \((e_A^2 + e_B^2 + \ldots)^{0.5}\) and for multiplication it is \(((e_A/A)^2 + (e_B/B)^2 + \ldots)^{0.5}\), where \(A\) and \(B\) are the variables, and \(e_A\) is the standard error in variable \(A\).

The individual measurements of \(\text{fCO}_{2w}\) have a combined standard uncertainty of less than 2 \(\mu\text{atm}\) based on a propagation of error of instrument response, equilibrator efficiency standardization, and temperatures and pressures at equilibration and at the sea surface (Pierrot et al., 2006). The performance and output data from the UWpCO\(_2\) systems have been checked at manufacturer, in intercomparison exercises, and at sea. SST measurements, at point of measurement, are accurate to 0.02˚C, and SSS to 0.1 based on instrument specifications and annual calibrations.

The combined standard uncertainty in gridded product will vary based on the number of measurements. It includes the actual variability in the 1˚ by 1˚ cells. To estimate the uncertainty per grid cell, the stdev of the \(\text{fCO}_{2w}\) in each cell was determined and then the average of the stdev for the 9924 cells with observations was taken. The average stdev was 3.4 ± 2.6 \(\mu\text{atm}\) (n=9224). The same procedure was followed for SST and SSS and yielded values of 0.22± 0.19 ˚C for SST; and 0.10± 0.10 for SSS. These were relatively small uncertainties compared to the monthly spatial range of ∼ 20 \(\mu\text{atm}\) for \(\text{fCO}_{2w}\) ∼1 ˚C for
The amplitude of the seasonal cycle of $\approx 40 \mu$atm for fCO$_{2w}$ and $\approx 4$ °C for SST were significantly greater than the standard uncertainties as well.

The calculated parameters for the gridded products, TA, pH$_T$, and Ω$_{Ar}$ have an added uncertainty due to the uncertainty in the constants and parameterizations. The agreement between TA-SSS relationships was good, and choice of TA relationship did not have a determining influence on results. We used TA=57.3 SSS OBS + 296.4 specifically developed for the Subtropical Western Atlantic (see insert of Figure 10 in Cai et al., 2010). The standard error for the relationship was 5.5 µmol kg$^{-1}$. The average stdv for salinity in the grid cells is 0.1 which translates in a uncertainty gridded TA of 5.8 µmol kg$^{-1}$. Thus the combined standard uncertainty for TA is $(5.5/2375)^2 + (5.8/2375)^2 = 8$ µmol kg$^{-1}$, where 2375 µmol kg$^{-1}$ is the average TA.

pH$_T$ is determined from fCO$_{2w}$ and calculated TA with associated uncertainties. An added uncertainty for the calculated pH$_T$ is the uncertainty in the dissociation constants that are used to calculate pH$_T$. These uncertainties can be calculated using a modified version of CO2SYS (Orr et al. 2018). As shown in Orr et al. (2018, Figure12), the uncertainty in the constants dominates the calculated pH$_T$. Using the uncertainty in the constants as presented in the program, an uncertainty of gridded TA of 8 µmol kg$^{-1}$ and 3.4 µatm for fCO$_{2w}$ yields an combined standard uncertainty in pH of 0.0075. For comparison the uncertainty in pH would be 0.0070 if state-of-the-art measurement uncertainties in TA of ±3 µmol kg$^{-1}$ and ±2 µatm for fCO$_{2w}$ are used. Similarly, the uncertainty Ω$_{Ar}$ using the same approach and uncertainties in independent parameters is ±0.20. Again it is the uncertainty in the dissociation constants that dominate the overall uncertainty.

For the mapped products there is the additional uncertainty through the use of regressions. The standard errors of the annual regressions in fCO$_{2wMLR}$ and the coefficients of the independent parameters are provided in Table 1. The average standard error for the fCO$_{2wMLR}$ for the 17 years is 6.4 ± 1.2 µatm. Following the approach above for the other independent parameters and propagating these uncertainties yields a combined standard uncertainty of 0.0090 in mapped pH and 0.21 in mapped Ω$_{Ar}$.

Systematic errors are introduced by the different SST and SSS data that are used for the gridded and mapped products, with the former using the gridded measured SST and SSS, and the latter the SSS$_{Hycom}$ and OISST products. The magnitude of the systematic uncertainty between the mapped and gridded product is estimated from the difference in the gridded and mapped parameters for cells that have both gridded and mapped products (Table 2). Another possible source of systematic uncertainty is using the gridded and mapped fCO$_{2w}$, SSS, and SST to calculate the TA, pH$_T$ and Ω$_{Ar}$ rather than using the in situ values to calculate the parameters and then gridding them. This uncertainty is small based on the low uncertainty of variables in each cell as shown from their stdv provided in the gridded products (Table 3).
This is confirmed by comparing this method with the approach of calculating the pH and then gridding and mapping as done in Lauvset et al. (2016) and Jiang et al. (2015). To examine the differences derived from using one or the other approach, both were compared for 2017 data. The pH and TA were calculated for every fCO$_{2w}$ observation and binned into a (1˚ x 1˚ x mo) grid. A MLR was from the calculated pH created for 2017:

$$\text{pH}(\pm 0.005) = 0.0003194 \text{Lon} - 0.00046744 \text{Lat} - 0.00965183 \text{SST} + 0.00019602 \text{MLD} + 0.00069378 \text{SSS} + 8.3240 \quad r^2 = 0.89 \quad (n = 1244) \quad (9)$$

This MLR was then applied to the independent variables for each grid box to determine pH$_{(\text{MLR})}$. This was compared to the approach used here of calculating the pH using the mapped fCO$_{2w}$ and TA-SSS relationships on (1˚ x 1˚ x mo) grids, called pH$_{(\text{fCO}_{2w}, \text{TA})}$. The two approaches provided similar results with pH$_{(\text{fCO}_{2w}, \text{TA})} - \text{pH}_{(\text{MLR})} = -0.0001 \pm 0.005$ for 2017. The small difference showed a pattern with SST (Fig. 6) but not with the other independent variables. The differences using either pH$_{(\text{fCO}_{2w}, \text{TA})}$ or pH$_{(\text{MLR})}$ are an order of magnitude smaller than the combined standard uncertainties such that the approach of using mapped fCO$_{2w}$ and TA to determine pH$_{(\text{MLR})}$ yielded precise and consistent gridded pH$_T$.

Calculated air-sea CO$_2$ fluxes have a significant uncertainty as they are driven by relatively small air-water concentration differences. Using the uncertainty in fCO$_{2wMLR}$ of 6.4 µatm and an uncertainty fCO$_{2a}$ of 1 µatm, and uncertainties in k of 20% (Wanninkhof, 2014) and $K_0$ of 0.002 (Weiss, 1974), the corresponding combined standard uncertainty is 21% for the flux. For Flux calculations the systematic error, or bias, is a big issue. The near-surface temperature gradient and skin temperatures will have an impact on the fCO$_{2w}$ and $K_0$. The magnitude, along with its applicability to the bulk flux formulation under debate (McGillis and Wanninkhof, 2006; Woolf et al., 2016). For the mapped product the OISST is used. The OISST uses a variety of temperature data, including remote sensing of the skin temperature and the product is adjusted to buoy temperatures nominally at 1-m (Reynolds et al., 2007) such that implicitly a common reference depth is used for fCO$_{2wMLR}$. As shown in Wanninkhof et al. (2019b) the OISST was on average 0.25 °C lower than SST, and using the SST instead of the OISST would change the flux from -0.87 to -0.63 mol m$^-2$ yr$^-1$ a 27% decrease. If OISST is used for bulk temperature and using a canonical value for difference in bulk and skin temperature of 0.17 °C, it would increase the uptake of CO$_2$ by 18% from -0.87 to -1.04 mol m$^-2$ yr$^-1$ or 18%. Based on current knowledge, we believe that using the OISST and the resulting calculated fCO$_{2wMLR}$ as was done here yields the appropriate fluxes.

### Table 2. Estimated uncertainties in measured, gridded, and mapped variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Combined Standard Uncertainty</th>
<th>Systematic Uncertainty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fCO$_{2w}$</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>2 µatm</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>0.1 per mil</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST</td>
<td>Measured</td>
<td>0.02 °C</td>
<td>\</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Datasets and data products

Several different data products are provided in conjunction with this paper. The methodology to create the products is described above, and here the file format and column headers is presented with a brief description when warranted.

4.1 Underway pCO$_2$ data

The quality controlled cruise data are posted at different locations. The individual cruise files with metadata can be found at
https://www.aoml.noaa.gov/ocd/ocdweb/occ.html. Data can be found as part of the SOCAT holdings (Bakker et al. 2016) using an interactive graphical user interface https://ferret.pmel.noaa.gov/socat/las/. In addition, cruise files of the three ships are provided in annual directories at the National Center for Environmental Information (NCEI) (https://www.nodc.noaa.gov/ocads/oceans/VOS_Program/explorer.html). The data file structures are from the MATLAB data reduction program of Pierrot (pers. comm.). The primary identifier for the cruises is the EXPO code which is the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) ship code and the day the ship starts the cruise. Examples are as follows: For a cruise of the EoS starting March 6, 2002, the EXPO code is 33KF20020330; for a AoS cruise starting...
November 25, 2018, the EXPO code is BHAF20181125, and for the Equx cruise departing her homeport on February 10, 2018, it is MLCE20180210. The individual cruise files at the sites above sometimes include data outside the study region.

4.2 Gridded data

The gridded datasets are the binned and averaged fCO\textsubscript{2w}, SST, and SSS observations on a (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) grid. The files include the auxiliary data obtained from remote sensing and interpolated data (OISST), data assimilation of remotely sensed winds (CCMP-2), and from the HYCOM model (SSS\text subscript{HYCOM}). Calculated TA, pH\textsubscript{T} and Ω\textsubscript{Ar} using procedures outlined above are provided in the file. The calculated fCO\textsubscript{2w} using the annual MLRs (Table 1) are provided as well. This gridded data set has spatial and temporal gaps as the ships did not transit through each pixel, and coverage is uneven. The number of observations differ for each grid cell and are listed in the gridded data set. For the auxiliary data the number of data points are fixed by the resolution of the data products except where part of the grid includes land which is masked. The column headers are provided in Table 3 and include units and descriptions when warranted.

Table 3. Column headers for the monthly 1-degree gridded observational product (1˚ by 1˚ by mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (January) through 12 (December)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude (Lat)</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>North is positive. Location is the center point of the grid cell. That is, 15.5˚ N is the grid box spanning 15˚ N to 16˚ N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude (Lon)</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>East is positive. All values in the Caribbean are negative. Location is center point of the grid cell. That is, -87.5 is the grid box spanning 87˚ W to 88˚ W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Km\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>Area of grid box excluding land where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#_Obs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of fCO\textsubscript{2w} observations in the particular grid box for the particular month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST_OBS</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Sea surface temperature measured at the intake (average of the grid box)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SST_STDDEV</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Standard deviation of SST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS_OBS</td>
<td>permil</td>
<td>Sea surface salinity measured by thermostalinograph (average of the grid box)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSS_STDDEV</td>
<td>permil</td>
<td>Standard deviation of SSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fCO\textsubscript{2w}_OBS</td>
<td>µatm</td>
<td>Fugacity of CO\textsubscript{2} in seawater (average of the grid box)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fCO\textsubscript{2w}_STDDEV</td>
<td></td>
<td>Standard deviation of fCO\textsubscript{2w} observations in the grid box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>µmol kg\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
<td>Total alkalinity calculated from a relationship salinity TA = 57.3 SSS_OBS + 296.4 (Cai et al., 2010) using the measured SSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH\textsubscript{T}</td>
<td></td>
<td>pH on the total scale at SST calculated from fCO\textsubscript{2w} OBS and TA using the CO2SYS program of Pierrot et al. (2006) with pH Scale: Total scale (mol/kg-SW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
at OISST; CO₂ Constants: K1, K2 from Lueker et al. (2000); KSO₄ for Dickson (1990); KF from Perez and Fraga (1987) and Total Boron from Uppström (1974)

| \( \Omega_{Ar} \) | Aragonite saturation state calculated using CO2SYS with \( f\text{CO}_2 \text{w}_{\text{OBS}} \) and TA as input parameters and the same dissociation constants as used for pH |
| OISST | °C | Optimal interpolated sea surface temperature (Reynolds et al., 2007) for the particular grid box |
| SSS\text{HYCOM} | permil | Sea surface salinity from the HYCOM model |
| \( f\text{CO}_2 \text{w}_{\text{MLR}} \) | \( \mu \text{atm} \) | Fugacity of CO₂ in seawater determined from annual MLRs (see Table 1) with Lat, Lon, SST, OISST, SSS\text{HYCOM}, and MLD\text{HYCOM}. |
The mapped product provides the data on a homogeneous (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) grid boxes utilizing the annual MLRs of $fCO_{2w}$ as a function of Lat, Lon, OISST, SSSHYCOM, and MLDHYCOM for the region from 15˚ N to 28˚ N and -62˚ to -88˚ (= 62˚ W to 88˚ W). The modeled and remotely sensed products OISST, SSSHYCOM, and MLDHYCOM and position were used in the MLR (Eq. 4) as the independent parameters. The mapped product includes the air-sea $CO_2$ fluxes in the region as a specific flux (mol m$^{-2}$ yr$^{-1}$) for each grid box. The column headers are provided in Table 4 including units and descriptions when warranted.

### Table 4. Column headers for the monthly 1-degree mapped product (1˚ by 1˚ by mo) for the whole region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (January) through 12 (December)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude (Lat)</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>North is positive. Location is center point of the grid cell. For example, 15.5˚ N is the grid box spanning 15˚ N to 16˚ N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude (Lon)</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>East is positive. All values in Caribbean are negative. Location is center point of the grid cell. For example, -87.5 is the grid box spanning 87˚ W to 88˚ W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Km$^2$</td>
<td>Area of grid box excluding land where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISST</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Optimal interpolated sea surface temperature (Reynolds et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSHYCOM</td>
<td>permil</td>
<td>Sea surface salinity Sea surface salinity from HYCOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLDHYCOM</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Mixed layer depth from the HYCOM model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$fCO_{2w,MLR}$</td>
<td>µatm</td>
<td>Fugacity of $CO_2$ in seawater determined from annual MLRs with Lat, Lon, SST, SSS, and MLD (see Table 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$fCO_{2a}$</td>
<td>µatm</td>
<td>Fugacity of $CO_2$ in air using the average value between atmospheric sampling station KEY and RBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ$CO_2$</td>
<td>µatm</td>
<td>Air water fugacity difference, $fCO_{2a}$ - $fCO_{2w}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>µmol kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>Total alkalinity calculated from a relationship salinity TA = 57.3SSSHYCOM$^+$ 296.4 (Cai et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td></td>
<td>pH calculated from $fCO_{2w}$ and TA with the CO2SYS program of Pierrot et al. (2006) with pH Scale: Total scale (mol/kg-SW) at OISST; CO$2$ Constants: K1, K2 from Lueker et al. (2000); KSO$4$ for Dickson (1990); KF from Perez and Fraga (1987) and Total Boron from Uppström (1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω$_{Ar}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aragonite saturation state calculated using CO2SYS with $fCO_{2w,MLR}$, TA, OISST,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and SSSHYCOM as input parameters with same dissociation constants as used for pH

\[ \langle u^2 \rangle \quad \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-2} \] Second moment of the wind based on \( \frac{1}{2} \) 6-h CCMP-2 product (Atlas et al., 2011)

CO\textsubscript{2} Flux \quad \text{mol m}^{-2} \text{yr}^{-1} \quad \text{Monthly air-sea CO}_2 \text{ flux calculated according to Eqs. 5 and 6, with fCO}_{wMLR} @ OISST}

4.4 Monthly and Annual estimates for the Caribbean 2002-2018

Summary files of monthly and annual data and products covering the whole region from 15° N to 28° N and 88° W and 62° W are provided based on averaging or summing the data in the mapped products. The column headers for the monthly and annual products are similar (Tables 5 and 6). For the monthly files the average of each parameter for each cell are area weighted based on the area of the cell as provided in the mapped product (Table 4) according to: area cell/(total area/#of cells). The total CO\textsubscript{2} mass flux (CO\textsubscript{2}_Flux\textsubscript{Total}) is the integral of the monthly area weighted CO\textsubscript{2} fluxes (mol m\textsuperscript{-2} yr\textsuperscript{-1}) expressed in teragrams carbon (= 10\textsuperscript{12} g C) per month or per year.

Table 5. Column headers for the monthly averaged mapped product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (January) through 12 (December)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>km\textsuperscript{2}</td>
<td>Total area of Caribbean region excluding land (15° N to 28° N and 62° W to 88° W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OISST</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>Optimal interpolated sea surface temperature (Reynolds et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSHYCOM</td>
<td>permil</td>
<td>Sea surface salinity from HYCOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLDHYCOM</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Mixed layer depth from the HYCOM model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fCO\textsubscript{wMLR}</td>
<td>µatm</td>
<td>Fugacity of CO\textsubscript{2} in seawater determined from annual MLRs with Lat, Lon, SST, SSS, and MLD (see Table 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fCO\textsubscript{a}</td>
<td>µatm</td>
<td>Fugacity of CO\textsubscript{2} in air using the average value between atmospheric sampling station KEY and RBP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔfCO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>µatm</td>
<td>Air-water fugacity difference, fCO\textsubscript{a} - fCO\textsubscript{w}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>µmol kg\textsuperscript{-1}</td>
<td>Total alkalinity calculated from a relationship salinity ( TA = 57.3\text{SSSHYCOM+296.4} ) (Cai et al., 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH\textsubscript{T}</td>
<td></td>
<td>pH calculated from fCO\textsubscript{a} and TA with the CO2SYS program of Pierrot et al. (2006) with pH Scale: Total scale at OISST; CO\textsubscript{2} Constants: K1, K2 from Lueker,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
et al. (2000); KSO₄⁻ for Dickson (1990); KF from Perez and Fraga (1987) and Total Boron from Uppström (1974)

| $\Omega_Ar$ | Aragonite saturation state calculated using CO2SYS with fCO₂wMLR, TA, OISST, and SSS HYCOM as input parameters with same dissociation constants as used for pHₜ |
| <$u^2$> | m² s⁻² | Second moment of the wind based on ⅓° 6-h CCMP-2 product (Atlas et al., 2011) |
| CO₂ Flux | mol m⁻² mo⁻¹ | Monthly air-sea CO₂ flux calculated according to Eqs. 5 and 6 |
| CO₂ Flux Total | Tg C mo⁻¹ | Total monthly air-sea CO₂ flux calculated according to Eqs. 5 and 6 in Teragram carbon |

Table 6. Column headers for the annual averaged mapped product

| Year | Area km² | Total area of Caribbean region, excluding land, from 15° N to 28° N and 62° W to 88° W |
| OISST °C | Optimal interpolated sea surface temperature (Reynolds et al., 2007) |
| SSS HYCOM permil | Sea surface salinity Sea surface salinity from HYCOM |
| MLD HYCOM m | Mixed layer depth from the HYCOM model |
| Area Km² | Area of grid box excluding the surface area of land where appropriate |
| fCO₂wMLR µatm | Fugacity of CO₂ in seawater determined from annual MLRs with Lat, Lon, SST, SSS, and MLD (see Table 1) |
| fCO₂a µatm | Fugacity of CO₂ in air using the average value between atmospheric sampling station KEY and RBP |
| ΔfCO₂ µatm | Air water fugacity difference, fCO₂w-fCO₂a |
| TA µmol kg⁻¹ | Total alkalinity calculated from a relationship salinity TA = 57.3 SSS HYCOM + 296.4 (Cai et al., 2010) |
| pHₜ | pH calculated from fCO₂w and TA with the CO2SYS program of Pierrot et al. (2006) with pH Scale: Total scale at OISST; CO₂ Constants: K₁, K₂ from Lueker et al. (2000); KSO₄⁻ for Dickson (1990); KF from Perez and Fraga (1987) and Total Boron from Uppström (1974) |
| $\Omega_Ar$ | Aragonite saturation state calculated using CO2SYS with fCO₂wMLR, TA, OISST, and SSS HYCOM as input parameters with same dissociation constants as used for pHₜ |
| <$u^2$> | m² s⁻² | Second moment of the wind based on ⅓° 6-h CCMP-2 product (Atlas et al., 2011) |
5 Data availability

The observations are available at three locations in slightly different formats but all files are stored by ship and cruise. The primary source is the website at the Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory (AOML) (https://www.aoml.noaa.gov/ocd/ocdweb/occ.html). These data are submitted to SOCAT at least once a year such that they can be posted in the annual updates of SOCAT (https://socat.info). The permanent depository of the data is at NCEI where the data are stored per cruise in directories listed per year (https://www.nodc.noaa.gov/ocads/oceans/VOS_Program/explorer.html). The gridded observations and mapped products described herein are posted at directories at AOML and NCEI. The dataset, and derived quantities are provided on a 1-degree monthly grid at http://accession.nodc.noaa.gov/0207749, DOI:10.25921/2swk-9w56 (Wanninkhof et al., 2019a). The products cover the years 2002 through 2018 and will be updated annually.

6 Conclusions

The datasets from the cruise ships sailing the Caribbean Sea are a rich resource for studying the trends and patterns of inorganic carbon cycling and ocean acidification in the region. The scales of variability and data density are such that the (1° by 1° by month) monthly gridding captures the magnitudes and trends of fCO$_2$ and derived inorganic carbon products on seasonal to interannual scales. Using annual MLRs to interpolate fCO$_2$ with position, SST, SSS, and MLD as independent variables yielded accurate monthly products (Wanninkhof et al., 2019a). A comprehensive investigation of the changes in decadal trends based on the dataset and products was presented in Wanninkhof et al. (2019b). The combined standard uncertainties and systematic offsets of gridding and mapping were estimated from comparing fCO$_2$ observations with gridded and mapped products including TA, pH$_T$ and Ω$_{Ar}$. The MLRs capture the spatial and temporal variability in fCO$_2$ and calculated pH$_T$ and Ω$_{Ar}$ well in the region. The datasets and products are invaluable for model initiation and validation, and serve as boundary conditions for near-shore fine scale models.
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Figure captions

Figure 1. Map with the cruise tracks of the EoS, Eqnx, and AoS from 2002 through 2018. The green rectangle depicts the region where the data and products are compared in Figure 4.

Figure 2. Histogram of number of cruises per year used in this work.

Figure 3. The difference in between fCO$_2$w MLR for subsequent months plotted versus time. The solid squares are the differences between December and January where different MLRs are used.

Figure 4. Zonal section of gridded and mapped products between 23° N and 24° N for January 2004 (Black), January 2011 (Blue), and January 2017 (Red). a. fCO$_2$w; b. SST; c. SSS. The lines with small solid circles are the mapped product, the larger solid circles are the gridded data with standard deviation of data in the box shown as error bars.

Figure 5. Relationships of surface water TA with salinity. The relationship of Cai et al. (2010), with standard error shown as error bars, is used to calculate pH and Ω$_{Ar}$ from fCO$_2$w.

Figure 6. pH$_T$ calculated from gridded fCO$_2$w and TA estimated from SSS, pH$_T$(fCO$_2$w,TA), as done in this work, minus pH$_T$ calculated from observed fCO$_2$w and TA from SSS, pH$_T$(MLR) plotted against temperature for the 2017 data.
Appendix A

A 17-year dataset of surface water fugacity of CO₂, along with calculated pH, Aragonite saturation state, and air-sea CO₂ fluxes in the Caribbean Sea

Rik Wanninkhof, Denis Pierrot, Kevin Sullivan, Leticia Barbero, and Joaquin Triñanes

Multi-linear regressions (MLRs) for \( f_{\text{CO}_2} \) were applied to the data on a \( 1' \) by \( 1' \) by \( 1 \) month grid using sequentially fewer independent parameters and the increase in residual was determined. This analysis was performed as two of the independent parameters used, sea surface salinity (SSS) and mixed layer depth (MLD), are modeled and their accuracy is not readily known. The functional form for the multi-linear regression, MLR fit is:

\[
f_{\text{CO}_2,\text{MLR}} = a_{\text{Lon}} + b_{\text{Lat}} + c_{\text{SST}} + [d_{\text{MLD}}] + [e_{\text{SSS}}] + f
\]  

(A1)

where

- \( \text{Lon} \) is longitude;
- \( \text{Lat} \) is latitude, and
- \( \text{SST} \) is sea surface temperature.

The MLR with the full number of independent parameters are used in the data products described in the main text and the resulting data products are in Wanninkhof et al. (2019a). The terms in brackets indicate the parameters omitted in the estimates here. The coefficients for the MLRs and their standard errors for each year without MLD, and the MLRs without MLD and SSS, are provided in Tables A1 and A2. SST and location are the strongest predictors of \( f_{\text{CO}_2} \) levels in the region. The increase in the average root mean square of the residual/error (RMSE) excluding MLD and SSS in the annual MLRs is shown in Tables A1 and A2. The average RMSE of the calculated \( f_{\text{CO}_2,\text{MLR}} \) increases by 8 ± 5.5 % by excluding MLD, and increases by 11 ± 5.4 % when MLD and SSS are omitted with the annual differences provided in the last column of Tables A1 and A2.

For the entire record, from 2002-2018, single regressions of \( f_{\text{CO}_2} \) with position, SST, SSS, and MLD showed larger standard errors and coefficients of determination \( (r^2) \) as they do not capture the increase in \( f_{\text{CO}_2} \) over time due to \( f_{\text{CO}_2} \) increases in response to increasing atmospheric CO₂ levels. Regressing against \( \Delta f_{\text{CO}_2} \) which, in principle should not have a trend over time if surface water CO₂ levels keep up with atmospheric CO₂ increases, did not improve the correlation with the independent parameters. This was attributed to the relatively small magnitude of \( \Delta f_{\text{CO}_2} \) and the observed multi-year changes in trends of \( f_{\text{CO}_2} \) (Wanninkhof et al., 2019b). However, using the year as a variable in the regression provides a reasonable means of extrapolating over the entire time/space domain with a single regression from 3/2002 through 2/2018:

\[
f_{\text{CO}_2,\text{MLR}} = 23.3 \pm 2.0 + 1.45 \pm 0.02 \text{ (YR-2002)} + 10.23 \pm 0.06 \text{ SST} + \text{terms in brackets}
\]
where YR is the integer calendar year. Thus YR-2002 is the year since the start of the record. The coefficient for the (YR-2002) term of 1.45 reflects the annual increase in surface water fCO$_2$ due to atmospheric fCO$_2$ increase, which averages 2.1 µatm yr$^{-1}$ over the 2002-2018 time period.

The standard error in the fCO$_2$,MLR of 7.8 µatm in Eq. A2 is generally greater than the standard error in the annual algorithms used to fill the gaps for the annual estimates (Eq. A1) that range from 4.7 to 9.9 µatm depending on the year with an average of 6.4 µatm (Table 1 in main text).

The importance of the different independent variables for the fCO$_2$,MLR can, in part, be discerned from the standard error in the coefficients but since variables are cross-correlated, other means are investigated such as creating a MLR with either a subset or substitution of variables. Physical parameters were correlated with location (Lat, Lon) in the region. In particular, salinity showed broad correspondence with position. Therefore, substituting SSS for Lat and Lon provided similar magnitude and standard error in the coefficients of the independent variable, but a 10% greater RMS in the estimated fCO$_2$:

fCO$_2$,MLR (±8.8) = -238 (±9.8) + 1.36 (±0.02) (YR-2002) + 10.11 (±0.06) SST + 9.07 (±0.25) SSS, $r^2$ = 0.79 (A3)

Finally, a simple two parameter linear fit with YR and SST had reasonable predictive capability:

fCO$_2$,MLR (±9.4) = 107.2 (±1.7) + 1.38 (±0.02) (YR-2002) + 9.50 (±0.06) SST, $r^2$ = 0.77 (A4)

Eq. A4 which used only SST and time showed an increase in the standard error of the derived independent variable fCO$_2$ compared to the other permutations of the MLR. This simple relationship did show some biases with location (not shown), and for gap filling to create uniform monthly fields of fCO$_2$ the full annual regressions (Table 1) using all independent parameters, SST, SSS, MLD and location was the best option.

| Table A1. Coefficients for the MLR, fCO$_2$,MLR = a Lon + b Lat + c SST + e SSS + f |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a (Lon) | b (Lat) | c (SST) | f (Icept) | RMSE fCO$_2$,MLR | $r^2$ | #points | % increase RMSE** |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>x</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>x+y</th>
<th>x-y</th>
<th>x-y*</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>x+y</th>
<th>x-y</th>
<th>x-y*</th>
<th>y</th>
<th>x+y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>-118.3</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>-198.3</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>-98.5</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>-246.0</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>-138.3</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>9.26</td>
<td>-7.8</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>-61.4</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>-157.1</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>12.27</td>
<td>-253.6</td>
<td>8.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>-256.5</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>-121.2</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>-112.0</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>a (Lon)</td>
<td>b (Lat)</td>
<td>c (SST)</td>
<td>f (Int)</td>
<td>RSME fCO2w,MLR</td>
<td>r²</td>
<td>#points</td>
<td>% Increase RMSE**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>9.56</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>-31.8</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>7.99</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>-13.8</td>
<td>8.22</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>-60.7</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The second row (in italics) for each annual entry is the error of the coefficient.

** The increase in root mean square error (RMSE) of fCO2w,MLR compared to Table 1 that includes MLD as an input.

Table A2. Coefficients for the MLR, fCO2w,MLR = a Lon + b Lat + c SST + f
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Error (CO₂)</th>
<th>CO₂ (µmol/kg)</th>
<th>fCO₂ (atm)</th>
<th>fCO₂ (ml/mol)</th>
<th>Error (fCO₂)</th>
<th>CO₂ (µmol/kg)</th>
<th>Error (CO₂)</th>
<th>CO₂ (µmol/kg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>44.94</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The second row (in italics) for each annual entry is the error of the coefficient.

** The increase in root mean square error (RMSE) of fCO₂w,MLR compared to Table 1 that included MLD and SSS as an independent variable.

This table is the same as Table A1 except that MLD in addition to SSS are omitted as independent variables.
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