

27 August 2014

The following document contains the authors' point by point response to the comments from two reviewers and a copy of the original manuscript highlighting the revisions made in response to reviewer suggestions.

1. Author Response to Reviewer: Claire Parkinson

Thank you for your helpful comments. We have revised our paper accordingly and feel that your comments helped clarify and improve our paper. Please find our response (in blue) to reviewer's specific comments (in black) below.

Specific Comments

– p. 3038, line 2. I would be inclined to add "(Version 3)" after "An updated version"; but if the authors disagree, they should leave it as is.

We have added "(Version 3)" to this sentence as it does add clarity for readers.

– p. 3038, line 2. I'm concerned about the mismatch between the title of the article, which mentions "sea ice melt onset", and the first sentence of the abstract, which instead mentions "snow melt onset".

The title has been changed to "Snowmelt onset over Arctic sea ice from passive microwave satellite data: 1979-2012".

– p. 3039, line 22. I'm fairly certain the authors meant a resolution of 25 km x 25 km rather than the much finer 25 km² resolution that is indicated.

Yes, this is correct. We have changed the resolution to "25 km x 25 km".

– p. 3040, second paragraph. This paragraph is extremely important in terms of letting the reader know what criteria were used in the calculations. However, it should be more explicit regarding the following two points:

(a) On lines 19-20, the text indicates that "the date is recorded as the day of melt onset." I'm guessing that at that point that particular location has received its melt onset date for the year and is not examined further for that year. If so, it would be best for the text to state that; and if not, the text should state what further is done for that location for that year.

(b) On lines 21-22, where it says "If the difference between Tbs during the periods prior to and following the day in question is > 7.5 K . . ." it should be made clear exactly which difference is being referred to. My guess is that it's the difference between the average of the 10 days prior and the average of the nine days following the day in question, but the current version of the text is not explicit enough to make that clear.

This paragraph has been edited to clarify these two points. You are correct that a MO date is only determined once per year for each pixel. That is, the algorithm does not examine a pixel

further once a MO date is assigned. In response to point (b), an average of the 10 days before and 9 days following is not used, but rather the difference between minimum and maximum daily horizontal ranges (HR) are calculated before and after the date in question then compared.

– p. 3041, lines 3-7. The two main sentences on these lines – “The previous version of the data set (V2) was masked to the climatology of locations where a MO date had been calculated for every year in the 20 year period 1979–1998. This climatology mask was static and determined the pixels for which a melt date was calculated every year.” – are not nearly as clear as the sentence that follows them on lines 7-9. I suggest rewording the two sentences on lines 3-7 to something along the lines of: “The previous version of the data set (V2) was masked in such a way that a melt date was calculated only at those locations where a MO date could be calculated for every year in the 20-year period 1979–1998.” As an additional comment: The shift from using a static mask is a major conceptual improvement over the Version 2 data set.

These two sentences were changed as suggested to improve clarity.

– p. 3041, lines 22-23. I think it would be more accurate to say that the difference in the data gap at the North Pole is due to the difference in the Nimbus 7 and DMSP satellite orbits as well as to the difference in the swath widths.

This has been corrected.

– p. 3042, lines 5, 8, and 10. On line 5, I think it would be much better to say “the Tbs are adjusted to improve . . .” rather than “the Tbs are corrected to improve . . .”, the reason being that the original Tbs aren’t “wrong”, they are simply not yet intercalibrated with the Tbs from the other sensors. Similarly, on line 8, “the F17 Tbs are also corrected back to F8 Tbs” would be better as “the F17 Tbs are also adjusted for intercalibration with the F8 Tbs”; on line 10, “regression correction” would be better as “regression adjustment”; and on p. 3040, line 10, “Tbs are corrected” would be better as “Tbs are adjusted for intercalibration”.

References to Tb “correction” have been removed.

– p. 3042, lines 13-14 and Figure 2. The fact that the statistics are only calculated at pixels where a melt onset date exists in all 35 years of the data set is very unfortunate, as it leaves out pixels whose trends could be of great interest, namely, both those that had no melt at the start of the record but melt by the end of the record and those that had melt at the start of the record but by the end of the record had no ice and hence no melt. I am definitely not recommending a change, as it’s important that the reader be told of this limitation, but it is an unfortunate limitation. Looking at Figure 2, it is clear that this limitation has greatly limited the area being considered in the Sea of Okhotsk, the Bering Sea, the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the Greenland Sea, the Barents Sea, and the Baltic Sea. In fact, for both the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Baltic Sea the area for the statistics is so restricted that it seems to be largely near-coastal points that likely have land contamination issues. However, despite that concern, the statistics by and large seem quite reasonable, suggesting that the algorithm is good.

We agree that the climatology mask used to calculate the statistics in this paper is a limitation, however, we opted to use the 34-year climatology mask to be consistent with past work (e.g.

Drobot and Anderson 2001). Comparisons between locations without a melt onset date in the earlier years of the data record and locations that now have observed melt onset in recent years would not have been possible using the old Version 2 data set. With Version 3, we believe that comparisons such as this would add valuable information about trends in melt onset for future work.

– p. 3043, lines 11-12. This sentence introducing the melt onset maps states that the MO dates “vary highly”. To me, it is at least as important that they vary systematically, as the melt onset progresses northward (Figure 3d). The text mentions the latitudinal dependence later in the paragraph, and so on line 11, I would simply recommend changing “vary highly” to “vary greatly but systematically”.

This has been changed in text.

– p. 3043, lines 20-23, Table 1, and Figure 3e. (Note: It’s important to add a comma after “Beaufort Seas” on line 22.) I can see from Table 1 that the East Siberian Sea comes out with the largest standard deviation, as stated on lines 22-23, but I encourage the authors to double-check those results in view of Figure 3e, where the northern Barents Sea has much higher values (though counteracted by the low values in the southern coastal strip of the Barents Sea) and even the Kara and Greenland Seas appear to have overall higher values than the East Siberian Sea. Everything might be correct, but I think the authors should check it. Also, assuming everything is correct, I recommend that the authors change “greatest standard deviation” to “greatest average regional standard deviation” in line 22, just for extra clarity, as Figure 3e clearly shows much greater individual pixel values elsewhere.

We have rechecked the statistics presented in Table 1 and the calculations are correct. However, it is important to note the values have not been weighted to account for the differences in region area. Since the Barents Sea region area is small ($3.5 \times 10^5 \text{ km}^2$) compared to other regions such as the E. Siberian Sea ($12.6 \times 10^5 \text{ km}^2$) or the Kara Sea ($8.3 \times 10^5 \text{ km}^2$) the average regional standard deviation is large (Table 1) especially considering that MO occurs on the sea ice in the southern Barents Sea consistently early in the year, near DOY 60. The standard deviation for only the southern Barents Sea would be small, but the higher variability in the northern Barents Sea coupled with the small region is a contributing factor to the large regional average standard deviation shown in Table 1 when compared to slightly smaller standard deviation for larger regions such as the E. Siberian Sea.

We have changed the wording on line 22 as suggested, added a comma following “Beaufort Seas”, and have also added a note to clarify that the region sizes are variable and no weighting for region size was implemented when calculating statistics.

– pp. 3043-3044 and Figure 3. Figure 3 is extremely informative. However, in the figure caption and the text, part (a) is the earliest MO date, (b) is the latest MO date, and (c) is the range of MO dates, whereas in the figure itself, (a) is the range, (b) is the earliest, and (c) is the latest. The figure needs to be fixed to match the caption and text (or vice versa).

Figure 3 (now Fig. 6) has been corrected to match the text and caption.

– p. 3044, lines 14-17. Here the later mean MO dates in the Central Arctic seem to be tied to the ice being more compact as well as to the latitude and temperature. Offhand, I don't see why the ice compactness would matter. I recommend rearranging these two sentences to: "Conversely, sea ice in the Central Arctic is typically thicker, more compact, multiyear ice. Furthermore, air temperatures would warm later in the year than further south, leading to the later mean MO dates observed."

[This wording change has been made.](#)

– p. 3044, line 18 – p. 3045, line 17. These two paragraphs could be shortened, by assuming that most readers will realize that in general, other things being equal, the MO dates along a given longitude should generally be later at higher latitudes. My inclination would be to delete at least lines 5-9 (and the last few words of line 4) on p. 3045, in view of the sentences preceding and following those lines.

[This sentence has been removed.](#)

– p. 3046, second paragraph. It would be relevant in this paragraph regarding the positive trend in the Bering Sea to reference one of the studies showing the complementary trends toward increases in sea ice extents in the Bering Sea. This would lend support to the validity of your result. One possible reference would be the following, which shows a positive trend in the Bering Sea and negative trends in each of the other eight Arctic regions discussed, for the period 1979-2010:

Cavalieri, D. J., and C. L. Parkinson, 2012: Arctic sea ice variability and trends, 1979- 2010, *The Cryosphere*, 6, 881-889, doi:10.5194/tc-6-881-2012.

[This reference has been added in support of our finding.](#)

– p. 3047, lines 7-8. To me, the fact that the timing of melt onset "has some dependence on latitude" is not much of a finding, as it seems it would be expected. Hence I recommend that lines 7-8 be reduced to: "Based on this 34-year record of MO dates on Arctic sea ice, we have shown that typically the sea . . ." However, if the authors prefer the original, they should leave it as is.

[The suggested wording is better and has been changed in the text.](#)

Apparent Typos

– p. 3042, line 18. It seems "differing colors" should be "different colors".

[Corrected](#)

– p. 3046, line 24. "... spring and can lead ..." should be "... spring can lead ..."

[Corrected](#)

– p. 3048, line 17. "indicate" should be "indicates".

Corrected

2. Author Response to Reviewer: Anonymous Referee #2

Thank you for your constructive comments. Reviewer comments (in black) are addressed by author comments (in blue) below.

General Comments: The manuscript is well-written and nicely presented but is very light on new information. The melt onset algorithm by Drobot and Anderson (2001) has been updated and the trends have been re-calculated but I'm not sure if that is sufficiently new information to warrant publication. My major concern is that Stroeve et al. (2014)-GRL just recently provided a new and thorough assessment of the links between melt, freeze and changing Arctic sea ice that includes trends and driving factors. Markus et al. (2009)-JGR also just fairly recently published a paper on melt and freeze trends. I think the authors need to add some new information to this work other than just updating the trends. I offer a few suggestions that hopefully could improve this contribution.

1. What about investigating the factors influencing melt onset? Drobot and Anderson (2001) looked at the relationship to the Arctic Oscillation. Does this relationship still hold? What about looking at some synoptic weather events driving melt? Else et al. (2014)-JGR (DOI: 10.1002/2013JC009672) provided a detailed look at the transition to melt onset over landfast sea ice which could be scaled up using NCEP or APP-x data.
2. Have the authors thought about comparing melt onset dates to climate model output? The operational ice forecasting community is very interested in knowing how well their models represent the timing of melt (and freeze). Wang et al. (2011)-JGR compared satellite derived melt onset to the Canadian Coupled Global Climate Model and noted model biases so perhaps other models could be looked at? Mortin et al. 2013-Climate Dynamics (DOI: 10.1007/s00382-013-1811-z) provide a very thorough approach of which some aspects could be used in your analysis.
3. What about adding a section to the manuscript comparing the AHRA approach with other melt algorithms? I realize the Markus et al. (2009)-JGR approach utilizes the AHRA as an indicator but I'm not sure about if there has been a comparison between the two approaches. There are also melt onset dates available by QuikSCAT and ASCAT that could also be used for comparison. See Mortin et al. 2014-RSE (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2013.11.004>) and Mortin et al. 2012-JGR (doi:10.1029/2012JC008001).

First we would like to disagree that this is light on new information. This data set has been used by many and the new extended dataset is an important part of the literature. Nevertheless, we have now included in this publication a more detailed discussion of the evaluation that was conducted in making this new data set and how the new data compares to the older version (see Section 3). This discussion highlights the spatial and temporal changes in the data. The three possible topics suggested by the reviewer are interesting and should probably be done. And at least one, atmospheric comparisons during melt, is a research project that this team is currently conducting. Preliminary results show that storm tracks are changing over time, however, the

amount of analysis and statistical relationships between melt and the atmosphere needed are way beyond the scope of the current paper and will need to be published independently. There is also more discussion regarding the other recent melt onset studies (Stroeve et al. 2014) in section 5, so hopefully this will fulfill the request for more work included in this publication.

Specific Comments: Title Suggest changing it to "Melt onset over Arctic sea ice..." or "Snowmelt onset over Arctic sea ice..." because that is what the Tb's are actually detecting.

We agree that the title is confusing. We have taken your suggestion and have changed the title to "Snowmelt onset over Arctic sea ice from passive microwave satellite data: 1979-2012".

Page 3040, Line 14 You could probably add a reference or two for the increases in liquid water that increases Tbs. I also think the authors should move the Drobot and Anderson (2001) reference to the start of the paragraph.

The Drobot and Anderson (2001) reference has been moved and two references have been added for the statement about liquid water increasing Tbs.

Kunzi, K. F., Patil, S., and Rott, H.: Snow-cover parameters retrieved from Nimbus-7 Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer (SMMR) data, IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens., GE-20, 4, 452-467, doi:10.1109/TGRS.1982.350411, 1982.

Livingstone, C. E., Singh, K. P., and Gray, L.: Seasonal and regional variations of active/passive microwave signatures of sea ice, IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens., GE-25, 2, 159-172, doi:10.1109/TGRS.1987.289815, 1987.

Page 3041 Line 11 I assume the author's mean NASATeam ice concentration estimates?

We use Goddard merged sea ice concentrations developed by Meier et al., 2013. These concentrations are developed from a method that combines sea ice concentrations from both the NASA Team and Bootstrap algorithms. We have added a sentence to the following to clarify that the concentrations we use are a combination of both the NASA Team and Bootstrap methods: "The concentration data used here are Goddard merged sea ice concentrations available as part of the NOAA/NSIDC Arctic Sea Ice Climate Data Record (Meier et al., 2013). The Goddard merged sea ice concentrations are based on an algorithm that utilizes a combination of sea ice concentrations from the Bootstrap and NASA Team sea ice concentration algorithms."

Meier, W., Fetterer, F., Savoie, M., Mallory, S., Duerr, R., and Stroeve, J.: NOAA/NSIDC climate data record of passive microwave sea ice concentration, Version 2, National Snow and Ice Data Center, Boulder, Colorado USA, doi:10.7265/N55M63M1, 2013.

Page 3041, Line 10 Based on the 50%> ice concentration threshold, when trends for the marginal ice zones are calculated they will not always be for the same number of years. I think this needs

to be shown visually because it influences the rates of change and perhaps your statistical significance because of reduced degrees of freedom. An iso-melt line showing spatially where the concentration is always greater than 50% would be useful and show where you have confidence in the trends.

We show an example of the changing ice edge as defined by the 50% ice concentration threshold in Figure 1, which compares the annual MO date map for 1979 with the map for 2012. We intended this figure to provide an example of the year to year variability in the sea ice edge, but have added a clearer description of the differences in these two maps and how they are a result of the 50% threshold. Sentences 2-3 in the paragraph following Page 3041, Line 10 now reads “The annual MO date maps for 1979 and 2012 in Fig. 1 illustrate the changing sea ice mask based on the 50% sea ice concentration threshold described above and serve as sample data from the V3 data set. Some noticeable differences in the ice edge between the 1979 and 2012 MO date maps occur in the Sea of Okhotsk and in the Baltic, Greenland, Barents, and Bering Seas (Fig. 1).”

Further, the first line of Section 2.3 noted that “All statistics reported here are calculated from pixel locations where a MO date exists in all 34 years of the data record.” Figure 2 shows a climatology mask of the pixel locations where a MO date exists for all 34 years in the data record. In this figure, white pixels indicate locations that are open water (concentration < 50%) or where a MO date does not exist for one or more years during the 1979 to 2012 (inclusive) study period. Grey pixels are the land mask. The pixels that are not white or grey represent the sea ice locations where a MO date exists for all 34 years (the different colors only define the boundaries between Arctic sub-regions). The colored pixels in Fig. 2 serve as both an indication of where we have confidence in the trends calculated and along the marginal edge of the ice cover show where the sea ice concentration at the beginning of March is always $\geq 50\%$.

To make this point clearer, we have added more description to the caption for Figure 2 and have changed the first five sentences of Sect. 2.3 to read:

“All statistics reported here are calculated from pixel locations where a MO date exists in all 34 years of the data record. The sea ice locations shown in Fig. 2 show the MO date climatology mask used in the calculation of statistics. Grey pixels representing land and white pixels representing open water and locations that do not have a melt date for one or more years and are excluded from all calculations. Statistics are calculated for all of the Arctic sea ice cover (hereafter called the Arctic Region) and for smaller sub-regions of the Arctic that are identified by different colors in Fig. 2. The area (in km²) for each sub-region of the Arctic is not equal in this work because we restrict calculations of statistics to the MO date climatology mask and implicitly the sea ice extent.”

Page 3041, Section 2.2 I think there is value to be added from a more detailed comparison between V2 and V3. The authors discuss the improvements made with V3 but could they be quantified?

We have added a new section (Section 3) and new figures (Figures 3-5) which show a detailed comparison of the primary differences users will see in the data between V2 and V3.

Page 3046 Perhaps it would be useful to look at the Bering Sea more closely? This could add another component to the manuscript (see General Comments). The authors could look at the ice concentration anomalies with respect to melt onset timing. Plotting air temperatures for the region might also lend some insight. A section on explaining regional melt onset variability could also be a useful addition.

Again this type of analysis while interesting is not within the scope of this publication.

3. Revised Manuscript

Snow melt onset over Arctic sea ice from passive microwave satellite data: 1979-2012

A. C. Bliss¹ and M. R. Anderson¹

[1]{Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, [214 Bessey Hall](#), Lincoln, Nebraska, [68588-0340](#)}

Correspondence to: A. C. Bliss (acbliss3@huskers.unl.edu)

Abstract

An updated version ([Version 3](#)) of the Snow Melt Onset Over Arctic Sea Ice from SMMR and SSM/I-SSMIS Brightness Temperatures is now available. The data record has been re-processed and extended to cover the years 1979-2012. From this data set, a statistical summary of melt onset (MO) dates on Arctic sea ice is presented. The mean MO date for the Arctic Region is 13 May (132.5 DOY) with a standard deviation of ± 7.3 days. Regionally, mean MO dates vary from 15 March (73.2 DOY) in the St. Lawrence Gulf to 10 June (160.9 DOY) in the Central Arctic. Statistically significant decadal trends indicate that MO is occurring 6.6 days decade⁻¹ earlier in the year for the Arctic Region. Regionally, MO trends are as great as -11.8 days decade⁻¹ in the East Siberian Sea. The Bering Sea is an outlier and MO is occurring 3.1 days decade⁻¹ later in the year.

1 Introduction

Changes in all aspects of the Arctic cryosphere observed by satellite since late 1978 have been dramatic over the last few decades. Record low annual sea ice extent minima were recorded numerous times in the last decade, most recently in September 2012 (Parkinson and Comiso, 2013). Sea ice is becoming increasingly young and thin (Maslanik et al., 2007, 2011; Kwok et al., 2009) and thus, is more susceptible to melting throughout the spring and summer months (Nghiem et al., 2007; Lindsay et al., 2009). The melt season is lengthening through changes in timing of the onset of melt in the spring and also by delaying the timing of freeze-up in the fall (Belchansky et al., 2004; Stroeve et al., 2006, 2014; Markus et al., 2009). Lengthening melt seasons increase ice volume loss in the Arctic, in particular, through earlier melt onset which strengthens the sea ice albedo feedback loop (Stroeve et al., 2006, 2014; Markus et al., 2009).

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: melt onset

The albedo changes on the sea ice surface that occur when melt begins allow for the absorption of solar radiation, which then increases the amount of melting that occurs within the ice-ocean system (Curry et al., 1995). An earlier date of melt onset on Arctic sea ice has a greater impact on the overall absorption of solar radiation in the ice-ocean system when compared to a lengthening of the melt season by a delay in the date of freeze-up in the fall (Perovich et al., 2007). Although no direct correlation between the melt onset date and September sea ice extent minima has been found (Wang et al., 2011), the date of melt onset in the Arctic signals the beginning of the melt season, and begins the ice-albedo feedbacks, which carry out through the remainder of the melt season (Stroeve et al., 2006; Markus et al., 2009).

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: 2009

Several algorithms exist to determine the date of melt onset on Arctic sea ice from passive microwave satellite observations (e.g. Smith, 1998; Drobot and Anderson, 2001; Belchansky et al., 2004; Markus et al., 2009) and also from active microwave satellite observations (e.g. Winebrenner et al., 1994; Forster et al., 2001; Kwok et al., 2003). However, melt onset dates from passive microwave observations are largely consistent for a longer time period (1979-present) than active microwave products.

We announce the release of the Snow Melt Onset Over Arctic Sea Ice from SMMR and SSM/I-SSMIS Brightness Temperatures, Version 3 (V3) data set that is now available for download from the National Snow and Ice Data Center (NSIDC) (Anderson et al., 2014), replacing the Version 2 (V2) data set. The melt onset (MO) dates in this updated data set are calculated using the Advanced Horizontal Range Algorithm (AHRA) developed by Drobot and Anderson (2001). The data set gives an annual view of the day of year (DOY) on which MO occurred at each pixel location. The data are available at a 25 km x 25 km resolution and are formatted using NSIDC's polar stereographic 304 x 448 pixel Northern Hemisphere grid. The data set has been reprocessed from passive microwave brightness temperatures (Tbs) to improve the consistency of data processing and extend the record of annual MO dates through the 2012 melt season. In this work, we provide a comparison of the differences between V2 and the V3 data sets, use the new V3 data set to provide an updated statistical summary of MO dates for the 1979-2012 record, and determine regional trends in the timing of MO for sea ice in the Arctic.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: km²

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: this

2 The data set and methodology

2.1 AHRA melt onset date calculation

The AHRA described by Drobot and Anderson (2001) utilizes horizontally polarized, daily-averaged, Tbs from the 18/19 GHz and 37 GHz channels. Tbs were obtained from the Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer (SMMR) on board the NASA Nimbus-7 satellite platform and the series of Special Sensor Microwave Imagers (SSM/I) and the Special Sensor Microwave Imager and Sounder (SMMIS) from the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program's F8, F11, F13, and F17 platforms. SMMR Tbs were collected every second day, while SSM/I and SSMIS Tbs are available daily. Prior to the calculation of melt dates, the Tbs from different sensors are intercalibrated using linear regression coefficients determined from sensor overlap areas using DMSP F8 as the baseline sensor (Jezek et al., 1991, Abdalati et al., 1995, Stroeve et al., 1998, W. Meier personal communication Oct. 2011).

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: corrected

The AHRA method (fully described by Drobot and Anderson, 2001) identifies the increase in Tbs when liquid water is introduced to the snowpack atop the sea ice (Kunzi et al., 1982, Livingstone et al., 1987). The AHRA tracks the difference between the 19 GHz (18 GHz for SMMR Tbs) and 37 GHz horizontally polarized Tbs at a given point (the horizontal range or HR) on a daily basis. If the HR for the day is >4.0 K it is assumed that wintertime conditions exist at the point. If the HR for the day is <-10.0 K then liquid water is likely present in the snow pack, causing a greater increase in the 37 GHz channel relative to the 18/19 GHz channel, and the date is recorded as the day of melt onset. Once a melt onset date is assigned at a pixel, the algorithm ignores the pixel for the remainder of the year. If the HR falls between -10.0 K and 4.0 K the 10 days prior and 9 days following the date in question are tested. In this stage of the algorithm, two values are calculated: [1] the minimum HR from the 10 days prior is subtracted from the maximum HR for the 10 days prior and [2] the minimum HR from the 9 days following is subtracted from the maximum HR in the 9 days following. The difference between min and max HR before and after the date being tested, are compared. If the difference between Tbs during the periods prior to and following the day in question is >7.5 K a melt onset date is assigned. If this value is <7.5 K no melt date is determined and the algorithm continues to the next day. During the testing stage of the algorithm, a large difference between the values prior to and following the date indicates a pattern shift in the time series of Tbs, thus the AHRA determines that melt onset has occurred. A MO date is only calculated once per year at each pixel. The use of the time series window surrounding the day makes the AHRA insensitive to spurious Tbs and weather interference.

2.2 Updates to the data set

For Version 3 of the data set, some changes to the processing were made in addition to updating the record of annual MO dates through the 2012 melt season. The previous version of the data set (V2) was masked in such a way that a MO date was calculated only at those locations where a MO date could be calculated for every year in the 20-year period 1979-1998. This climatology mask was static and determined the pixels for which a melt date was calculated every year. The new data set (V3) no longer uses a static mask; instead, the MO dates are calculated for locations determined to be sea ice covered at the beginning of each melt season. The melt dates in a given year are calculated for pixel locations where sea ice concentration is $\geq 50\%$ on one or both of the first two days with Tb data in March. The concentration data used here are Goddard merged sea ice concentrations available as part of the NOAA/NSIDC Arctic Sea Ice Climate Data Record (Meier et al., 2013). The Goddard merged sea ice concentrations are based on an algorithm that utilizes a combination of sea ice concentrations from the Bootstrap and NASA Team sea ice concentration algorithms. The beginning of March is used to represent full sea ice extent, since early March roughly corresponds to the annual maximum Arctic sea ice extent (e.g. Parkinson and Comiso, 2013). The first two days of data in March are used to account for days on which sea ice concentrations may be missing. Tbs were collected every second day during SMMR years (1979-1987); therefore, the sea ice concentrations used to create the ice mask for the MO dates data set may include two days during 1-5 March.

Since the sea ice mask is no longer static, the sea ice locations (especially along the ice edge) that experience MO throughout the melt season change from year to year. The annual MO date maps for 1979 and 2012 in Fig. 1 illustrate the changing sea ice mask based on the 50% sea ice

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: Tbs

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: .

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: method

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: .

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: difference

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: difference

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: If the difference

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: this

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: See Drobot and Anderson (2001) for full details on the algorithm.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: to the climatology of

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: had been

[concentration threshold described above](#) and serve as sample data from the V3 data set. [Some noticeable differences in the ice edge between the 1979 and 2012 MO date maps occur in the Sea of Okhotsk and in the Baltic, Greenland, Barents, and Bering Seas \(Fig. 1\)](#). Due to the differences in [orbit and](#) swath width between the SMMR and SSM/I-SSMIS sensors, the data gap surrounding the North Pole (the pole hole) changes in diameter; examples of this can be seen in Fig. 1. The V2 climatology mask eliminated the difference between pole hole diameter that occurs; however, the reduction in diameter increases the amount of sea ice area for which MO is calculated, thus, increasing usefulness of the data for users who may subset the time series. Additionally, V2 of the data set included a 2-pixel buffer that eliminated coastal sea ice locations where possible uncertainties in the Tbs from land-ocean spillover can occur. Newer versions of the Tb data have now corrected for this spillover uncertainty (Cavalieri et al., 1999); therefore, the buffer is no longer used for V3.

As noted above, before MO is calculated, the Tbs are [adjusted](#) to improve inter-sensor calibration using linear regression coefficients. Version 3 of the data set extends the record using Tbs from the DMSP F17 satellite for the years 2008-2012. To be consistent with the rest of the record, the F17 Tbs are also [adjusted for intercalibration with](#) F8 Tbs using regression coefficients provided by W. Meier (personal communication Oct. 2011). Additionally, an erroneous application of the regression [adjustment](#) between SSM/I sensors on the DMSP F11 and F13 platforms was found and corrected for V3.

2.3 Calculation of statistics

All statistics reported here are calculated from pixel locations where a MO date exists in all 34 years of the data record. The sea ice locations [shown](#) in Fig. 2 show the MO date climatology mask used in the calculation of statistics. [Grey pixels representing land and white pixels representing open water or](#) locations [that](#) do not have a melt date for one or more years are excluded [from all calculations](#). Statistics are calculated for all of the Arctic sea ice cover (hereafter called the Arctic Region) and for smaller sub-regions of the Arctic that are identified by [different](#) colors in Fig. 2. The area (in km²) for each sub-region of the Arctic is not equal in this work because we restrict calculations of statistics to the MO date climatology mask and implicitly the sea ice extent. We divide the Arctic into common geographic regions. The regional boundaries used here are the same as used by Meier et al. (2007) except we include sea ice locations within the Baltic Sea. These regional boundaries are also similar to those of other works including Markus et al. (2009) and Parkinson et al. (1999) except that the region mask used here divides regions within the Arctic Ocean into smaller seas. The sea ice area for each region (in km²) is presented in Table 1. The area for the Arctic Region is the area sum of all 15 sub-regions. [It is important to note that the statistics presented in this paper are not weighted by region size.](#)

All maps of summary statistics including the earliest MO date, latest MO date, range of MO dates, mean and standard deviation are calculated from the time series of MO dates at each individual pixel for 1979-2012. Regional statistics presented in Table 1 are calculated from the annual mean MO dates in each region [\(provided in Supplement Table S1\)](#). The mean earliest MO and mean latest MO values presented in Table 1 represent the earliest and latest of the annual mean MO dates, rather than the absolute earliest and latest MO dates from the 34-year

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: corrected

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: corrected back to

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: correction

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: (indicated by color)

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: Pixel

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: in white

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: and

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: differing

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: then

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: .

record that appear in Fig. 6a-b. Regional trends are calculated from the slope of the least squares linear regression best-fit line on the time series of annual mean MO dates.

3 Comparison of V3 and V2 melt onset data

As a comparison between the V3 and V2 MO dates, we use MO dates from the years 1992 and 2004 to illustrate the improvements and differences users will find in the updated data set. The primary differences between V3 and V2 MO dates in 1992 occur along the marginal sea ice zone (Fig. 3a-b). As described in Sect. 2.2, the V2 MO data included a 2-pixel wide buffer to reduce possible ocean-land spillover (black pixels surrounding the coastline in Fig. 3b). In V3 this buffer has been removed since spillover is not considered a problem in the Tb data and MO dates are calculated adjacent to land locations. A difference map is shown in Fig. 3c, excluding the coastline pixels. The difference map is calculated by subtracting MO dates from V2 from the V3 MO dates. Thus positive values show where V3 MO dates are later (larger) than V2 MO dates and negative values show where V2 MO dates are earlier (smaller) than V3 MO dates. The algorithm used to calculate MO dates is the same for V2 and V3, thus there are no differences in the MO dates within the sea ice pack (Fig. 3c).

Aside from the coastline pixels, the differences that do occur between 1992 MO data versions occur along the sea ice periphery in the marginal seas (Fig. 3c). These locations are a result of the different sea ice masks used to determine sea ice locations where MO should be calculated. V2 used a static climatology mask where MO dates were calculated at the same locations every year, while the V3 MO dates are calculated where the 50% sea ice concentration threshold (see Sect. 2.2) is met for that individual year. Fig. 3d categorizes the differences shown in Fig. 3c by which version of the data the differing MO dates occur. Pixels along the ice edge shown in blue are new MO locations where the sea ice extended beyond the V2 climatology mask. These pixels are locations where a MO date was calculated in V3, but was excluded by the climate mask used in V2. Red pixel locations (Fig. 3d), however, are pixel locations where a MO date was calculated in V2, but not in V3. That is, any sea ice cover at the beginning of March did not meet the 50% concentration threshold and a MO date was not calculated in V3. However, in these cases the climatology mask allowed for MO to be detected in V2.

The Tbs used to calculate the MO dates for 1992 were obtained from the SSM/I onboard the DMSP F11 satellite. The Tbs used to calculate the MO dates for 2004 were obtained from the SSM/I onboard the DMSP F13 satellite. An error in the intercalibration adjustment used in V2 was found and corrected for V3. As a result, 2004 and all other F13 years (1996-2007) have differences in MO dates within the sea ice pack rather than only along the coastline and ice edge in other years of the record (e.g. Fig. 3g). The regression equation was adapted to correctly adjust the Tbs to the F8 baseline sensor; thus, the differences between V3 and V2 for 2004 are primarily negative (Fig. 3g) indicating that the corrected V3 MO dates are primarily earlier in the year than V2 MO dates would suggest.

Figures 4-5 show scatter plots of a pixel-by-pixel comparison of the V3 MO dates versus the V2 MO dates. In 1992, the majority of MO dates do not change between versions (Fig. 4) and the majority of the points fall along the one to one line. The differences in MO dates that do occur are related to the coastline and ice edge issues described above. The differences between V2 and V3 for 2004 do not fall along the one to one line (Fig. 5). There is a large scatter of points to the

[left of the line depicting the earlier MO dates in V3 due to the intercalibration adjustment changes.](#)

4 Melt onset statistics 1979-2012

Mean MO dates for the Arctic Region during the 34-year data record vary [greatly but systematically](#) across the extent of sea ice cover (Fig. [6](#)); however, the mean date of MO for the Arctic Region is 13 May (132.5 DOY) with a standard deviation of ± 7.3 days (Table 1). In general, the mean MO dates occur earliest at sea ice locations along the periphery of the sea ice edge and in the southernmost locations such as the Sea of Okhotsk, Bering Sea, Hudson Bay, Gulf of St. Lawrence, Greenland Sea, Baltic Sea, and Barents Sea (Table 1, Fig. [6d](#)). This indicates a general latitudinal dependence on the timing of MO; however, the standard deviation of MO dates can be large in portions of these early-melting regions. Regions with higher standard deviations in mean MO date have higher variability in MO timing from year to year. The regions with the highest standard deviations occur in parts of the Arctic Ocean, including: the Barents, Kara, Laptev, East Siberian, Chukchi, and Beaufort Seas, with the greatest [average regional](#) standard deviation (± 14.5 days) occurring in the East Siberian Sea (Table 1).

The earliest MO dates during 1979-2012 occur at the beginning of the melt season, in early March, for most of the peripheral regions of the sea ice area (Fig. [6a](#)). For portions of the Central Arctic, Canadian Archipelago, and the northern portion of the Beaufort Sea, the earliest MO dates do not occur until mid-late May. The earliest MO dates in other portions of the sea ice within the Arctic Ocean occur in late March and early April (warm colors in Fig. [6a](#)). The latest MO dates in the record for much of the sea ice regions within the Arctic Ocean occur during August, while the coastal regions of the Arctic Ocean typically have the latest MO dates near the end of May through June (Fig. [6b](#)). Two distinct areas of the sea ice cover appear to have a small range (warm colors in Fig. [6c](#)), [1] in the peripheral sea ice regions (including the Sea of Okhotsk, the Bering Sea, the Labrador Sea (in the Baffin Bay region), and the southern Barents Sea) and [2] the North American side of the Arctic including parts of the Central Arctic, the northern Beaufort Sea, and the Canadian Archipelago regions. The variability in MO dates described by both ranges and standard deviations for these locations is small; however, the timing of MO is distinctly different. In the southern, peripheral regions, where the sea ice is primarily composed of seasonal, first year ice, air temperatures warm to the melting point earlier in the year and early MO dates are observed. Conversely, sea ice in the Central Arctic is typically thicker, [more compact](#), multiyear ice. [Furthermore](#), air temperatures would warm later in the year than [farther south](#), leading to the later mean MO dates observed.

The St. Lawrence Gulf and Baltic Sea regions have the earliest mean MO dates, occurring 15 March (73.2 DOY) and 20 March (78.8 DOY), respectively, although both areas are small (0.1×10^5 and 0.2×10^5 km²) (Table 1). Other regions with relatively early mean MO dates (Table 1) are the Bering Sea, 21 March (79.9 DOY); the Sea of Okhotsk, 22 March (80.8 DOY); and the Barents Sea, 4 April (93.9 DOY). However, it is important to note that the early-melting sea ice in the Barents Sea is located in the southern, coastal portion of the region, while the sea ice in the northern half of the Barents, adjacent to the Central Arctic region, melts at a later date (Fig. [6d](#)). The other peripheral and southern regions including: Hudson Bay, Baffin Bay, and the Greenland Sea have a mean MO date which occurs in the latter half of April. The remaining regions are located within the Arctic Ocean and have mean MO dates that range from 11 May (130.5 DOY) in the Kara Sea to 10 June (160.9 DOY) in the Central Arctic region (Table 1).

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: highly

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: 3

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: 3d

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: 3a

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: 3a

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: 3b

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: 3c

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: Sea ice concentrations would tend to be higher in this area and

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: at southern locations

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: 3d

MO dates can vary widely from year to year in Arctic sub-regions depending on when the air temperatures in different regions reach the melting point. Although, on average, there is latitudinal dependence on timing of MO, springtime weather conditions and temperature anomalies are important for explaining the year to year variability in MO timing for much of the sea ice within the Arctic Ocean (Anderson and Drobot, 2001; Belchansky et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2011; Markus et al., 2009). Springtime weather conditions, including cyclonic activity, can have an influence on the air temperatures and the surface energy budget of the sea ice through the trapping of longwave heat when conditions are cloudy or through increased incoming shortwave radiation when conditions are cloud free and the sun rises in spring.

5 Trends in melt onset dates

Trends in the time series of annual mean MO dates indicate that MO is occurring earlier in the year for the majority of Arctic sea ice over the 1979-2012 data record (Fig. 7). For the Arctic Region, a statistically significant trend (99% confidence level) of -6.6 days decade⁻¹ exists, indicating that MO is occurring earlier in the year in recent years when compared to the earliest years of the data record. Statistically significant negative trends also exist for sub-regions of the Arctic Ocean including: the Barents, Kara, Laptev, East Siberian, Chukchi, and Beaufort Seas, and the Canadian Archipelago and the Central Arctic region (99% confidence level). These trends range from -4.6 days decade⁻¹ in the Canadian Archipelago to -11.8 days decade⁻¹ in the East Siberian Sea. R^2 values vary, but are strongest for the Arctic Region and the Central Arctic where the R^2 value is at least 0.76 (Fig. 7). Statistically significant trends also exist in the Bering Sea and Baffin Bay although at a 95% confidence level with weak R^2 values (Fig. 7). Southerly, peripheral regions of the sea ice where the mean MO dates occur earliest, as described in Sect. 4, tend to have very weak R^2 relationships and insignificant trends, although the trend is negative for nearly all regions.

An interesting finding to note is the statistically significant (95% confidence level) positive trend occurring in the Bering Sea. The Bering Sea is the only region of sea ice that shows a trend towards later MO dates through the data record. The relationship is weak (R^2 of 0.18) and the area of sea ice in the region is small (2.7×10^5 km²), however, this region is showing an anomalous change in MO that is different from all other regions. Calculations for these trends and statistics are normalized to locations where MO dates exist in all years of the data record; however, the ice edge in this data set changes from year to year with the extent of sea ice at the beginning of March. Therefore it is interesting to note that the sea ice cover is actually more extensive in the Bering Sea in recent years than in the earliest years of the data record, as noted by the positive yearly trend in sea ice extent described by Cavalieri and Parkinson (2012). The sea ice extent trend is apparent and complementary to the positive trend in V3 MO dates. For an example of this, see Fig. 1, where Bering Sea ice extent (using the 50% concentration threshold) is greater in 2012 than in 1979.

The MO dates presented here are similar to the “early melt onset” dates determined by Markus et al. (2009) although differences in melt dates reported by both works occur due to differences in data processing. Table 2 provides a comparison of trends in the mean MO dates presented here and early melt onset trends reported by Stroeve et al. (2014), an update to the Markus et al. (2009) melt season length analysis. In general, the direction of trends towards earlier melt onset

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: There is some latitudinal dependence on the timing as indicated by the general pattern of mean MO dates where earliest MO occurs along the ice edge and at southernmost regions (Fig. 3); however, higher standard deviations and larger mean ranges in some sub-regions such as the Barents, Kara, Laptev, East Siberian, and Chukchi Seas indicate that there is a good amount of year to year variability in the timing of MO at the regional scale.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: 2009

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: 4

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: 4

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: 4

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: 3

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: .

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: The mean

is in agreement for most regions (except for the Sea of Okhotsk). However, for some regions including the Arctic Region, the Laptev, East Siberian, and Chukchi Seas, the magnitudes of the trends are different by 5 days decade⁻¹ or larger (Table 2). The greatest magnitude difference in trends occurs for the East Siberian Sea where a 10 day decade⁻¹ difference between trends is observed, however, the Stroeve et al. (2014) trend is not statistically significant. Similar statistically significant trends do exist for the Barents and Kara Seas and Baffin Bay where the difference in trends is ≤ 4 days decade⁻¹. Another comparison can be made with the melt onset trend for the Canadian Arctic Archipelago determined by Howell et al. (2009) which reported a statistically significant trend of -3.1 days decade⁻¹. The early melt onset trend for the Canadian Arctic Archipelago determined by Stroeve et al. (2014) is -1.0 days decade⁻¹ (not statistically significant), while the trend for the V3 mean MO dates reported here is -4.6 days decade⁻¹ (99% confidence level).

Each method for determining trends in MO dates produces a different value due to differences in the algorithm and data processing steps used to produce the melt dates. Despite these differences, various methods for determining MO dates show a significant trend towards increasingly early MO for the majority of Arctic sea ice, in agreement with the works of others (e.g. Stroeve et al., 2006, 2014; Markus et al., 2009). Earlier MO on sea ice increases the amount of solar radiation that can be absorbed by the ice-ocean system by reducing surface albedo during the time of the year when solar radiation is greatest (Perovich et al., 2007). Increased absorption of solar radiation during the spring can lead to increased heating in the Arctic, extensive loss of sea ice volume, and a delay in freeze-up following the melt season (Stroeve et al., 2014).

6 Summary

We have described an updated record of MO dates over Arctic sea ice that is now available for download from NSIDC (Anderson et al., 2014). This new data set utilizes the AHRA method for calculating the date of MO from passive microwave satellite data, which has improved consistency and been updated to include recent data from the SSMIS satellite sensor through 2012.

Based on this 34-year record of MO dates on Arctic sea ice we have shown that typically the sea ice periphery and southerly-located seas experience MO early in the year during the months of March and April, while northerly locations, in the central and western Arctic Ocean, experience MO in mid-late May. However, increased variability in regions within the Arctic Ocean shows that there is considerable year to year variability in MO timing which is attributed to variability in springtime weather conditions.

The 34-year record of MO dates shows significant, negative trends for the majority of the Arctic that indicate earlier MO. These trends in MO are on par with the warming trends observed in the Arctic over recent decades and the overall reduction of sea ice volume. However, the positive trend in the Bering Sea indicates the regional nature of MO timing and the need for more investigation into the variability of regional-scale atmospheric conditions surrounding the timing of MO.

Author Contribution

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

~~Deleted:~~ and

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

~~Deleted:~~ the timing of MO, on average, has some dependence on latitude. Typically,

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

~~Deleted:~~ indicate

A. [C. Bliss](#) and M. [R. Anderson](#) collaborated on the ideas presented in this manuscript and in generation of data for [Table 1](#) and [Fig. 7](#). M. [R. Anderson](#) produced maps for [Fig. 3](#) and created plots for [Figs. 4-5](#). A. [C. Bliss](#) created [Fig. 2](#) and wrote the initial draft of this manuscript with review and editing provided by M. [R. Anderson](#).

Acknowledgements

The Snow Melt Onset Over Arctic Sea Ice from SMMR and SSM/I-SSMIS Brightness Temperatures, Version 3 data set is available from NSIDC, Boulder, Colorado, USA (http://nsidc.org/data/docs/daac/nsidc0105_arctic_snowmelt_onset_dates.gd.html).

This work was supported by NASA MEaSURES award NNX08AP34A. The authors thank W. Meier for providing regression coefficients used in the development of this data set and [two](#) reviewers for their constructive comments.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: B.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: A.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: table

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: fig. 4. A. B.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: fig.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: A

References

Abdalati, W., Steffen, K., Otto, C., and Jezek, K. C.: Comparison of Brightness Temperatures from SSM/I Instruments on the DMSP F8 and F11 Satellites for Antarctica and the Greenland Ice Sheet, *Int. J. Remote Sens.*, 16, 7, 1223-1229, doi: 10.1080/01431169508954473, 1995.

Anderson, M. R., and Drobot, S. D.: Spatial and temporal variability in snowmelt onset over Arctic sea ice, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 33, 74-78, 2001.

Anderson, M. R., Bliss, A. C., and Drobot, S. D.: Snow melt onset over Arctic sea ice from SMMR and SSM/I-SSMIS brightness temperatures, Version 3, 1979–2012, NASA DAAC at 15 the National Snow and Ice Data Center, Boulder, Colorado, USA, available at: <http://nsidc.org/data/nsidc-0105.html>, last access: 2 June 2014.

Belchansky, G. I., Douglas, D. C., and Platonov, N. G.: Duration of the Arctic sea ice melt season: regional and interannual variability 1979-2001, *J. Climate*, 17, 67-80, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(2004)017<0067:DOTASI>2.0.CO;2, 2004.

Cavalieri, D. J. and Parkinson, C. L.: Arctic sea ice variability and trends, 1979–2010, *The Cryosphere*, 6, 881-889, doi:10.5194/tc-6-881-2012, 2012.

Cavalieri, D., Parkinson, C., Gloersen, P., Comiso, J., and Zwally, H. J.: Deriving long-term time series of sea ice cover from satellite passive-microwave multisensor data sets, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, C7, 15,803-15,814, doi:10.1029/1999JC900081, 1999.

Curry, J. A., Schramm, J. L., and Ebert, E. E.: Sea ice-albedo climate feedback mechanism, *J. Climate*, 8, 240-247, doi:10.1175/1520-0442(1995)008<0240:SIACFM>2.0.CO;2, 1995.

Drobot, S. D., and Anderson, M. R.: An improved method for determining snowmelt onset dates over Arctic sea ice using Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer and Special Sensor Microwave/Imager data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 106, D20, 24,033-24,049, doi:10.1029/2000JD000171, 2001.

Forster, R. R., Long, D. G., Jezek, K. C., Drobot, S. D., and Anderson, M. R.: The onset of Arctic sea-ice snowmelt as detected with passive- and active-microwave remote sensing, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 33, 85–93, doi:10.3189/172756401781818428, 2001.

Howell, S. E. L., Duguay, C. R., and Markus, T.: Sea ice conditions and melt season duration variability within the Canadian Arctic Archipelago: 1979-2008, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 36, L10502, doi:10.1029/2009GL037681.

Jezek, K. C., Merry, C., Cavalieri, D., Grace, S., Bedner, J., Wilson, D., and Lampkin, D.: Comparison between SMMR and SSM/I passive microwave data collected over the Antarctic ice sheet, Byrd Polar Research Center Technical Report, no. 91-03, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio USA, 1991.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: ., Bliss, A. C., and Drobot, S. D.: Snow melt onset over Arctic sea ice from SMMR and SSM/I

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: brightness temperatures, Version 3, [1979-2012], NASA DAAC at the National Snow and Ice Data Center, Boulder, Colorado USA, <http://nsidc.org/data/nsidc-0105.html>, 2014. ... [1]

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: M.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: R

[Kunzi, K. F., Patil, S., and Rott, H.: Snow-cover parameters retrieved from Nimbus-7 Scanning Multichannel Microwave Radiometer \(SMMR\) data, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, GE-20, 4, 452-467, doi:10.1109/TGRS.1982.350411, 1982.](#)

Kwok, R., Cunningham, G. F., and Nghiem, S. V.: A study of melt onset in RADARSAT SAR imagery, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, C11, 3363, doi:10.1029/2002JC001363, 2003.

Kwok, R., Cunningham, G. F., Wensnahan, M., Rigor, I., Zwally, H. J., and Yi, D.: Thinning and volume loss of the Arctic Ocean sea ice cover: 2003 – 2008, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, C07005, doi:10.1029/2009JC005312, 2009.

Lindsay, R. W., Zhang, J., Schweiger, A., Steele, M., and Stern, H.: Arctic sea ice retreat in 2007 follows thinning trend, *J. Climate*, 22, 165–176, doi:10.1175/2008JCLI2521.1, 2009.

[Livingstone, C. E., Singh, K. P., and Gray, L.: Seasonal and regional variations of active/passive microwave signatures of sea ice, *IEEE Trans. Geosci. Remote Sens.*, GE-25, 2, 159-172, doi:10.1109/TGRS.1987.289815, 1987.](#)

Markus, T., Stroeve, J. C., and Miller, J.: Recent changes in Arctic sea ice melt onset, freezeup, and melt season length, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 114, C12024, doi:10.1029/2009JC005436, 2009.

Maslanik, J., Drobot, S., Fowler, C., Emery, W., and Barry, R.: On the Arctic climate paradox and the continuing role of atmospheric circulation in affecting sea ice conditions, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L03711, doi:10.1029/2006GL028269, 2007.

Maslanik, J., Stroeve, J., Fowler, C., and Emery, W.: Distribution and trends in Arctic sea ice age through spring 2011, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L13502, doi:10.1029/2011GL047735, 2011.

Meier, W., Fetterer, F., Savoie, M., Mallory, S., Duerr, R., and Stroeve, J.: NOAA/NSIDC climate data record of passive microwave sea ice concentration, Version 2, National Snow and Ice Data Center, Boulder, Colorado USA, doi:10.7265/N55M63M1, 2013.

Meier, W. N., Stroeve, J., and Fetterer, F.: Wither Arctic sea ice? A clear signal of decline regionally, seasonally and extending beyond the satellite record, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 46, 428-434, doi:10.3189/172756407782871170, 2007.

Nghiem, S. V., Rigor, I. G., Perovich, D. K., Clemente-Colón, P., Weatherly, J. W., and Neumann, G.: Rapid reduction of Arctic perennial sea ice, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L19504, doi:10.1029/2007GL031138, 2007.

Parkinson, C. L., and Comiso, J. C.: On the 2012 record low Arctic sea ice cover: combined impact of preconditioning and an August storm, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 1356-1361, doi:10.1002/grl.50349, 2013.

Parkinson, C. L., Cavalieri, D. J., Gloersen, P., Zwally, H. J., and Comiso, J. C.: Arctic sea ice extents, areas, and trends, 1978–1996, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104, C9, 20,837–20,856, doi:10.1029/1999JC900082, 1999.

Perovich, D. K., Nghiem, S. V., Markus, T., and Schweiger, A.: Seasonal evolution and interannual variability of the local solar energy absorbed by the Arctic sea ice–ocean system, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, C03005, doi:10.1029/2006JC003558, 2007.

Smith, D. M.: Observation of perennial Arctic sea ice melt and freeze-up using passive microwave data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 103, C12, 27,753–27,769, doi:10.1029/98JC02416, 1998.

Stroeve, J. C., Markus, T., Boisvert, L., Miller, J., and Barrett, A.: Changes in Arctic melt season and implications for sea ice loss, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 41, 1216–1225, doi:10.1002/2013GL058951, 2014.

Stroeve, J., Markus, T., Meier, W., and Miller, J.: Recent changes in the Arctic melt season, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 44, 367–374, doi:10.3189/172756406781811583, 2006.

Stroeve, J., Maslanik, J., and Xiaoming, L.: An intercomparison of DMSP F11- and F13-derived sea ice products, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 64, 132–152, doi:10.1016/S0034-4257(97)00174-0, 1998.

Wang, L., Wolken, G. J., Sharp, M. J., Howell, S. E. L., Derksen, C., Brown, R. D., Markus, T., and Cole, J.: Integrated pan-Arctic melt onset detection from satellite active and passive microwave measurements, 2000–2009, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, D22103, doi:10.1029/2011JD016256, 2011.

Winebrenner, D. P., Nelson, E. D., Colony, R., and West, R. D.: Observation of melt onset on multiyear Arctic sea ice using the ERS-1 synthetic aperture radar, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 99, 22,425–22,441, doi:10.1029/94JC01268, 1994.

Table 1. Mean Regional Melt Onset Date Statistics for 1979-2012.

	Region Area (10 ⁵ km ²)	Mean MO date (DOY)	Mean Standard Deviation (days)	Mean Earliest MO (DOY)	Mean Latest MO (DOY)	Mean Range (days)
Arctic Region	110.0	13 May (132.5)	7.3	121.0	146.5	25.5
Barents Sea	3.5	4 April (93.9)	12.2	69.5	121.8	52.2
Kara Sea	8.3	11 May (130.5)	12.8	98.4	152.4	54.0
Laptev Sea	8.4	25 May (144.9)	11.7	115.9	167.1	51.2
East Siberian Sea	12.6	31 May (150.1)	14.5	127.4	174.8	47.4
Chukchi Sea	8.2	17 May (136.3)	12.7	112.6	160.6	48.0
Beaufort Sea	9.0	28 May (148.0)	9.9	130.1	165.3	35.2
Canadian Archipelago	7.4	29 May (149.0)	7.7	135.9	168.2	32.2
Central Arctic	17.9	10 June (160.9)	9.5	143.8	181.5	37.7
Sea of Okhotsk	6.3	22 March (80.8)	5.3	70.9	93.3	22.4
Bering Sea	2.7	21 March (79.9)	7.2	69.8	95.7	25.9
Hudson Bay	13.3	17 April (106.6)	8.6	89.2	125.0	35.8
Baffin Bay	8.2	1 May (120.6)	10.0	102.5	137.7	35.2
Greenland Sea	4.0	29 April (118.9)	11.1	96.3	135.0	38.7
Baltic Sea	0.2	20 March (78.8)	10.4	63.0	99.4	36.4
St. Lawrence Gulf	0.1	15 March (73.2)	6.4	62.1	91.6	29.4

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM

Deleted: [Page Break](#)
Figure Captions .

Table 2. Comparison of Trends^a in V3 Mean MO Date with Other Reported Trends (in days decade⁻¹).

	<u>Mean MO</u> <u>Date Trend</u> <u>(1979-2012)</u>	<u>Stroeve et al., 2014</u> <u>Early Melt</u> <u>Onset Trend</u> <u>(1979-2013)</u>	<u>Howell et al., 2009</u> <u>Melt Onset</u> <u>Trend</u> <u>(1979-2008)</u>
<u>Arctic Region</u>	-6.6	-1.9	--
<u>Barents Sea</u>	-7.6	-7.1	--
<u>Kara Sea</u>	-9.2	-5.2	--
<u>Laptev Sea</u>	-8.2	-2.8*	--
<u>East Siberian Sea</u>	-11.8	-1.8	--
<u>Chukchi Sea</u>	-8.3	-1.6	--
<u>Beaufort Sea</u>	-7.2	-2.4*	--
<u>Canadian Archipelago</u>	-4.6	-1.0	-3.1*
<u>Central Arctic</u>	-8.3	-2.5	--
<u>Sea of Okhotsk</u>	-1.0	1.9	--
<u>Bering Sea</u>	3.1*	1.4	--
<u>Hudson Bay</u>	-2.8	-3.3*	--
<u>Baffin Bay</u>	-4.3*	-3.3*	--
<u>Greenland Sea</u>	-3.6	-5.5	--
<u>Baltic Sea</u>	-5.1	--	--
<u>St. Lawrence Gulf</u>	-0.6	--	--

^aBold indicates statistical significance at the 99% confidence level. An * indicates statistical significance at the 95% confidence level.




Figure 1. Annual melt onset date maps for (a) 1979 and (b) 2012 [maps available from Anderson et al., 2014].




Figure 2. Melt onset date 34-year climatology and region map. White pixels indicate open water locations and locations where a MO date is not calculated for one or more years in the 34-year climatology. Different colors indicate the Arctic sub-regions used in this study.




Figure 3. Comparison of V2 and V3 MO dates for 1992 and 2004. Difference maps show V2 MO dates subtracted from V3 MO dates. Categorized difference maps classify the differences between V2 and V3 MO dates by the type or cause of the differences between versions.




Figure 4. Scatter plot of V3 MO dates versus V2 MO dates for 1992 with 1:1 line.




Figure 5. Scatter plot of V3 MO dates versus V2 MO dates for 2004 with 1:1 line.




Figure 6. (a) Earliest, (b) latest, (c) range, (d) mean, and (e) standard deviation of melt onset dates for the 1979-2012 record [maps available from Anderson et al., 2014].




Figure 7. Time series of annual mean MO date and least squares linear regression trend for the Arctic Region and sub-regions. The R^2 value and decadal trend (days decade⁻¹) are shown for each region. Bold trends are statistically significant at a 99% confidence level. An * indicates statistically significant trends at a 95% confidence level.

Angela Bliss 8/27/14 3:47 PM
Deleted: 4