

## ***Interactive comment on “Parameterization of atmosphere–surface exchange of CO<sub>2</sub> over sea ice” by L. L. Sørensen et al.***

**L. L. Sørensen et al.**

lls@dmu.dk

Received and published: 28 November 2013

I have attached the response to all 3 review

Response to review 2: In general the reviewer suggest to put more focus on the deviations from the traditional use of the resistance methodology for terrestrial surfaces (specific comment: P3903 L4-7) because the data material is too weak to confirm/reject the parameterization suggested in the paper. The original objective of this paper was to discuss the application of the resistance parameterization over the sea ice and the deviation and parallels to the application over terrestrial areas. However it seems that our attempt failed, thus we will write this more clearly in the introduction and also expand the discussion on this subject. It is true that we have not made an effort to show any statistic or quality assurance of our flux measurements.

C2562

This off cause should have been done. We will in a new version of the manuscript expand section 3 and use not only the inertial dissipation method but also the co-spectra peak method (using high and low frequency of the sample spectra) according to Sørensen and Larsen, 2010; Norman et al, 2013 and Mørk et al., 2013 to assure the quality of our flux data and we will provide error bars to our fluxes. During our data analysis we addressed the heating issues at low temperatures and corrections for these for the Licor 7500 IR instrument, but did just not go into details in our paper. We carried out a careful inspection of the cospectra and only those cases, where a clear upward or downward flux could be identified, were used in the paper. Furthermore we will discuss detection limits to flux measurements in relation to our measurements. P3901 L20: We did observe melting of the ice during our study, however the point of our study was not to examine what happens during ice formation or ice melting, but to suggest a parameterization for fluxes over the sea ice and to suggest and discuss which parameters (e.g. heat fluxes) could influence the exchange. The exchange over the sea ice is depending on the age of the ice. Multiyear ice is more solid and might not be exchanging with the atmosphere at all, where annual ice, which will be more abundant in a warmer climate, will exchange with the atmosphere. P3902 L9: We will rewrite this sentence because the assumption of the sea-ice acting as a lid on the sea surface inhibiting the atmosphere to exchange with the surface is still abundant. We will also add references to models using this assumption (e.g. Toggweiler et al., 2003). P3902 L16: Will be changed to “total inorganic carbon (TCO<sub>2</sub>)” P3903 L4-17: We will put more focus on the discussion of the parameterization (see our response above) Section 2: We agree that this could be shortened if the paper was only addressing atmospheric scientist, but here we will like to keep section 2 as it is. The purpose of the paper is also to reach the ocean (including sea ice) modeling community and experimentalist who measures carbon in sea ice, to study the transport of CO<sub>2</sub> within the ice, and fluxes over sea ice using chamber methods. This group of sea ice researchers is not familiar with the literature on flux parameterization over terrestrial surfaces and many are not familiar with micrometeorology or micrometeorological

C2563

techniques, thus we find it important to state a summary of the basic theory here. P3909 L1-20: We agree. Some of the fluxes are below or close to detection limit. This will be stated clear in the next version of the paper which will have new mean flux calculations based on three different analysis techniques, and error bars will be provided for figure 3. This will also be addressed in the discussion on especially  $R_c$ , since the small fluxes and high uncertainty on the flux direction will lead to negative  $R_c$ , however the biggest uncertainty is due to lack of knowledge of the carbonate chemistry in sea ice. Therefore we will expand on the discussion on  $pCO_2$  in the sea ice, which is calculated based on Goyet and Poisson, which is probably not adequate for calculation of  $pCO_2$  in sea ice brines, since this does not take the formation of  $CaCO_3$  in ice into account. Studies of sea ice and carbonate chemistry (Søgaard et al., 2013, Rysgaard et al., 2013; Geilfus et al., 2012, Miller et al., 2011) emphasize the importance of formation and dissolution of  $CaCO_3$  on levels  $pCO_2$  in the brines. P3910 L11: "Equality" in this context, means, when the flux estimated by the inertial dissipation technique and the flux estimated by the covariance technique gives the same result. This will be rephrased in the next version of the paper, since this specific part will be rewritten to clarify the data treatment and the assessment of uncertainty. P3911 L22: Jackson et al., 2013 and McGinnins et al., 2013 will be added to the reference list. P3912 L15: The negative  $R_c$ s are due to the large uncertainty of the  $pCO_2$  (discussion on  $pCO_2$  in sea ice will be expanded) estimates and the small fluxes increasing the uncertainty on the fluxes which makes it difficult to estimate the direction of the flux. The smaller the flux the larger the  $R_c$ , but also the more difficult it is to estimate the sign on  $R_c$ . We will provide a more detailed discussion on  $pCO_2$ , which is really introducing the largest uncertainty in the estimation of  $R_c$ , since we probably have under saturation of  $pCO_2$  due to formation of  $CaCO_3$  at low ice temperatures. The formation of  $CaCO_3$  will be discussed in a new version of the manuscript. P3913 L5-11: We think the statement can be confirmed by figure 3 and 4, as we write. In figure 3 upward fluxes (and not uptakes, which will be negative fluxes) appears mainly in the beginning of the measurement period, in figure 4 we see

C2564

that these are periods are associated with temperature drops. We think the reviewer has misunderstood the explanation and we will rephrase it in the updated manuscript. P3914 L6: It is true that  $R_c$ s at times are negative (however this has changed in our new calculations based on the review from reviewer #1). However when we see negative  $R_c$  it is due to an opposite directed  $CO_2$  gradient and  $CO_2$  flux. The  $pCO_2$  in the brine is estimated to be higher than the atmospheric  $pCO_2$ . This is because the production and precipitation of  $CaCO_3$  is not taken into account, when calculating the  $pCO_2$ . This will be addressed in an updated manuscript. 3914 L11-15: We agree the statement seem to contradict. We meant to say that the potential for an uptake (downward flux) increase. 3915 L3-6:  $R_c$  and temperature are not independent, which we also state on 3915 L5-7. P3915 L9: This is not regarded "ice melting season". However the temperature in this area can have large variations, and just before we started our field measurements the air temperature was just above zero and right after we ended our field work the air temperature was 1-2 C for 2 days (Søgaard et al, 2013).

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.the-cryosphere-discuss.net/7/C2562/2013/tcd-7-C2562-2013-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 7, 3899, 2013.

C2565