

## Responses to James Orr (Reviewer 2 )

*We thank James Orr for his suggestions and all the work he has done. The manuscript will greatly improve from this, both scientifically and structurally. Please find below our responses (in blue italics) to the comments (in black). References to line numbers, figures and tables refer to the revised manuscript, unless stated otherwise.*

This manuscript uses observations and a model to assess the regional details of acidification of the Nordic Seas during the industrial era through to the end of this century. The authors find that during 1981-2019, the change in surface ocean pH is larger than would be expected from the corresponding change in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. They ascribe the cause to an evolution of surface ocean pCO<sub>2</sub>, which while remaining undersaturated with respect to the atmosphere, increases at a rate faster than atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub>. They suggest that the main driver of the change in pH is the DIC increase associated with ocean uptake of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub>. They also find that observed pH changes may be detected down to 2000 m in some parts of the Norwegian seas. The authors further focus on corresponding changes in the saturation state of waters with respect to aragonite and corresponding changes in the aragonite saturation horizon and what those changes may mean for cold water corals. In their model, most cold water corals would not be exposed to waters that are undersaturated with respect to aragonite under the low-end RCP2.6 and mid-range RCP4.5 emissions scenarios. But under the high-end RCP8.5 emissions scenario, most of those corals would be exposed to such conditions, which are unfavorable for their long-term survival.

Overall the authors have addressed an important topic, the details of acidification of the Norwegian Seas, a regional focus that has not been addressed previously. They appear to have used all the best data available for this assessment, thanks to the many coauthors with observational expertise in the Norwegian Seas. Also included are coauthors who are experts in using the chosen model routinely to assess ocean acidification and related aspects of ocean biogeochemistry. The Abstract and Introduction (sections 1-3) generally establish the need for this study, the Methods section appears to provide sufficient detail except for the final subsection, and the Results and Discussion sections reveal much effort being devoted to the analysis.

Yet despite these positive aspects, there is also much room for improvement.

CONCERNS in order of importance:

(1) Unfortunately, there seems to be a complete lack of understanding of what a pH change actually means. Although pH offers a convenient way to represent the hydrogen ion concentration, its log scale means a pH change actually represents a relative change in [H<sup>+</sup>], not an absolute change (Kwiatkowski and Orr, 2018). That relative change is unlike the change in any other CO<sub>2</sub> system variable, all being absolute. Focusing only on pH and not [H<sup>+</sup>] can give a completely wrong impression, e.g., as in this manuscript when it is used to compare changes at different depths and at different locations (Fassbender et al., 2020). Looking only at pH change, as in the manuscript, we cannot know what part of the change is due to a change in [H<sup>+</sup>] and what part is actually due to differences in the reference [H<sup>+</sup>], the starting point. The manuscript neglects this key point entirely, not even mentioning hydrogen ion concentration. Rem-

edging this problem will require major revisions.

*Thank you for pointing this out, it is a very important remark. Please note that the pH variations in this study are relatively small, and our results do therefore not look significantly different if analyzing  $H^+$  instead (we remade all our plots showing pH change to verify this).*

*Because the manuscript is intended to address people outside of science, we prefer staying with pH in the plots in the main manuscript. We believe that this quantity is more well known than  $H^+$  concentration. However, we have carefully revised the text in the manuscript to avoid any misinterpretations related to this, and to discuss this issue. The revisions include:*

*i) link between pH and  $H^+$  in the introduction (lines 23-24, and section 1.1)*

*ii) A short paragraph on the potential caveats, with the references, that you mentioned (lines 200-204)*

*ii) one representative figure in supplementary material, with accompanying table, (Fig. S17 and Table 7), showing the trends in  $H^+$  calculated from the observations.*

(2) Projections with only one model are unreliable. Model projections are hard to publish nowadays without using multiple models and for good reason. One model can give very different results from others. A range of models provides an estimate of model uncertainty, and the model mean typically performs better than any given model. Because the ocean component of the NorESM1-ME model relies on a dynamic isopycnic vertical coordinate, we might expect it to have very different results in simulated deep-ocean anthropogenic carbon concentrations relative to most other CMIP models. Modeling centers such as the one where some of the authors of this manuscript are associated seem to now have access to and experience working with the CMIP5 or CMIP6 models. All analyses in the current manuscript need NOT be repeated with all models. But it will be needed to show at least where the NorESM1-ME model is situated relative to other Earth system models, in terms of the depth distribution of anthropogenic carbon concentrations (and perhaps also  $[H^+]$  and  $\Omega_{Ar}$ ) in the different regions of the Norwegian Seas.

*Thank you for this comment, we agree with this. In order to show where the NorESM1-ME model is situated, we additionally made a timeseries plot showing the simulated pH at three different depths of the Nordic Seas for an ensemble of CMIP5 models that we put in the supplementary material and that we mention in the discussion (Fig. S5). Furthermore, we decided to analyze the output of these CMIP5 models for the section on future saturation horizon and cold-water corals (Section 4.2).*

*Unfortunately, the CMIP5 database only contains output for the RCP8.5 when considering emission driven runs (which we used for the manuscript), which is why we could not make a sensitivity analysis for the other scenarios. Considering that NorESM1-ME1 simulates among the higher acidification rates in deep waters in our model-ensemble, it is likely that the estimates of the future saturation horizon from NorESM is in the upper bound.*

(3) The description of the decomposition of the drivers (namely the equations in section 4.4) is weak and incomplete.

a) Eq. (1) comes from Takahashi et al. (1993) and is fine except that the authors

will need to replace the Greek delta  $\delta$  with the correct partial sign  $\partial$  in all the partial derivatives. This is not a major problem, just the convention of multivariate calculus. The  $\delta$  is used for something else (inexact differential). Please don't confuse them.'

*Thank you for noticing this, we have changed the delta to the correct partial sign.*

b) Eq. (2) is added by the authors but is unnecessary. That equation comes from Metzler et al. (2010), who expanded each partial derivative in Eq. (1) to get at so-called "known quantities". Such complexity is no longer necessary because all of the partial derivatives in Eq. (1) are now easily available as precise quantities in "derivnum", an add-on package to CO2SYS-MATLAB (Orr et al., 2018). See <https://github.com/jamesorr/CO2SYS-MATLAB>

The simpler choice, just deleting Eq. (2), is preferred and avoids unnecessary complexity that can lead to mistakes in implementation. For instance, the authors' four definitions that immediately follow Eq. (2) are ambiguous because they are missing key parentheses. Hopefully their actual code is less ambiguous. There is no longer any need to introduce all these extra terms.

*We have followed the recommendations of the reviewer and removed equation 2, we agree that this is not needed, and we instead added some short text on how the derivatives were calculated. The derivnum-package would have been very useful for us, and is something we will implement in future studies. However, for this study we did not use it as the scripts and analyses were written/starting before its release.*

c) Eq. (3) should be recast in the same pattern as Eq. (1), i.e., replacing  $f\text{CO}_2$  with  $[\text{H}^+]$ . It should not be cast in terms of pH (as in the current manuscript) for reasons mentioned in (1) above. The partial derivatives of  $[\text{H}^+]$  are also available in derivnum. That routine is called with the same arguments as CO2SYS, with one argument added in the beginning to specify what the user wants to take partial derivatives with respect to. This further move towards simplicity will avoid the old-fashioned complexity that is now in the manuscript. Furthermore, this change will help avoid misinterpretation of what changes in pH mean.

*We have rewritten equation 3 in terms of  $d[\text{H}^+]/dt$  to prevent any confusions of what pH changes mean. Because we did not use the derivnum as explained above, we will keep the same pattern as it currently has.*

d) An equation is missing in Section 4.4 concerning the freshwater Taylor-series decomposition, results of which are presented in Fig. S8. With that equation, the appropriate citations need to be given, starting with Lovenduski et al. (2007). For the associated salinity normalization, the authors must also specify their choices of the regional salinity references and if those remain constant or change with time. Furthermore, the authors will need to mention why they generally seem to prefer to use the older, less complicated decomposition from Takahashi et al. (1993).

*You are correct that we forgot to add this, we have added a description with the necessary equation and references in section 1 in the Supplementary material. We prefer to stay with*

*the older version because the net impact of freshwater is generally negligible due to the opposing effects on DIC and alkalinity (we explain this at lines 236-239).*

e) Another equation is missing in Section 4.4 concerning what the authors call “pHperf”. Currently that term is mentioned in the short final paragraph of section 4.4, where the authors attempt to describe how they compute “the pH change in seawater that perfectly tracks atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>”. Unfortunately, the current description does not tell us exactly what the authors have done. For instance, in the calculation of pHperf, do the authors use i) the actual atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> as the reference value along with the atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> change or ii) the oceanic pCO<sub>2</sub> as the reference value, to which they add the change in atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub>? The importance of this question is illustrated with a simple example. Suppose atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> is at 400 μatm and oceanic pCO<sub>2</sub> is at 300 μatm. Although a 1 μatm change in pCO<sub>2</sub> starting at 300 μatm produces only a 0.7% greater change in [H<sup>+</sup>] when compared to starting at 400 μatm, the corresponding change in pH is 30% greater in the former relative to the latter. The reason is that a change in pH represents a relative change in [H<sup>+</sup>], i.e., relative to the [H<sup>+</sup>] of the starting point. These numbers slightly depend on the other reference conditions, which I have arbitrarily set to T=2 °C, S=35, ALK=2300 μmol/kg, nutrients=0. If the authors have used approach (i), the results will be wrong. The authors should be able to resolve this issue by using approach (ii) and by adding an equation and improving the text to avoid ambiguities.

*Thank you for the illustrative example showing the importance of this. We used approach (i). We fully agree with the reviewer that approach ii) should be used. We therefore remade the calculations and the plots and we have added some text at lines 240-245 to make the description clearer. Because the calculation is relatively simple, we think that an equation is not necessary.*

A related minor question: Do the authors actually use atmospheric xCO<sub>2</sub> (ppm) or do they first convert that to atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> (μatm), making corrections for water vapor pressure and atmospheric pressure?

*We did not make any corrections for water vapour and atmospheric pressure because the rates of change for xCO<sub>2</sub> and pCO<sub>2</sub> are the same, this is now clarified.*

(4) The section on cold-water corals is too cursory. The authors’ analysis of the change in the aragonite saturation state to which cold-water corals are exposed has potential, but the authors devote only one rather short paragraph to describing the results, which are presented in one figure. They authors also neglect to clearly attribute previous studies that have attempted the same type of exercise using model projections and cold-water coral positions. Additionally, the data set used in the manuscript for coral positions is not cited adequately, and the authors do not give enough information about their procedure for extracting the saturation state from the model. For instance, is the model sampled at the depth of the coral (as provided in the data base) or is the depth taken to be that of the model’s bottom depth at a coral’s latitude and longitude? More discussion of results and the addition of uncertainties from a multi-model analysis would seem critical.

*We agree that this section was very short. We have revised it by:*

- i) working on the text and including more details about our results*
- ii) adding results from several ESMs*
- iii) adding a few references using a similar approach*

*We additionally provide more details about the dataset and calculations in Section 2.1.4.*

(5) The writing needs improvement. Getting through this manuscript was not easy. Although there are few if any errors in English, and individual sentences generally work well, the manuscript would benefit if the authors could redouble their efforts to improve flow between sentences. That is, connections between sentences are often rough, causing the reader to slow down and sometimes stop. Also lacking is coherence in many individual paragraphs. My recommendation would be for the authors to consult the book by J. M. Williams (Style The Basics of Clarity and Grace), and in particular the short chapter on Cohesion and Coherence. Then they could go through the manuscript trying to improve both aspects. If one cannot borrow this book from a library or colleague, older editions only cost about 10 euros. It offers the potential to dramatically improve one's writing by applying a few basic principles.

*We are grateful for the book suggestion. We have worked on the flow of the manuscript , and think that it now reads better and we hope that you agree.*

(6) The figures need improvements. Some figures appear to have too many panels, some figures should be combined, and some figures should be deleted. There are also other issues.

*The figures have been revised:*

- Fig. 1: Addition of colorbar and position for time -series stations*
- Fig. 2: The spatial standard deviation of future scenarios are in transparent*
- Maps and sections: color ranges have been revised, plots for calcite have been removed*
- Figs: 6 & 7: the parabolic lines showing the uncertainty range of the regression model has been removed, and the trend-numbers have been moved to tables*
- The sections showing future changes have been combined to one figure (Fig. 9 in the revised manuscript)*
- figure 11: the pH expected from the atmospheric change in pCO<sub>2</sub> has been removed from deeper layers*
- figure 14: white space has been removed, and we have added results from several CMIP5 models*

a) In Fig. S6, it seems that only 3 out of the 6 regions seem to show a trend in surface ocean pCO<sub>2</sub> that is significantly greater (statistically speaking) than that of atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> . Thus I am unconvinced by the statement that it is only the Barents Sea Opening does not follow this pattern. More care is needed when handling this subject in the revised manuscript.

*The reviewer is correct, we did not pay enough attention to the significance of the trends and their differences when we were discussing this. After checking the significance, we found that the trend is greater than the atmospheric one in the Norwegian Basin and in the Iceland basin. Based on the comments from reviewer 1 we also made an attempt to estimate the impact of seasonal undersampling on the trends by calculating the trends for the productive season only (April-September, and June-August, respectively). We found these results to be sensitive to which months that are used for the calculation, showing that there are large uncertainties related to the seasonal distribution of the sampling. We therefore decided to put less focus on the pCO<sub>2</sub> change (although we still discuss it), and we also removed this from the abstract.*

b) In Figs. 3, 7, and 9, the third row of maps for  $\Omega_{Ca}$  should be deleted because it exhibits the same patterns as for  $\Omega_{Ar}$  in the second row, only differing by a constant. Their constant relationship could be briefly mentioned once in the text rather than wasting space in each of those three figures. Likewise, Fig. S5 for  $\Omega_{Ca}$  should be deleted because it shows exactly the same patterns as  $\Omega_{Ar}$  in Fig. 6.

*Thank you for this remark, we have removed the figures showing  $\Omega_{Ca}$ .*

c) In Figs. 5 and 6, the numbers given in each panel for the slope and uncertainty should be moved to a table, where it will be easier to compare numbers between regions and depth layers. The same goes for the corresponding supplementary figures (Figs S1-S4). In addition, there are often too many significant figures in the slope and uncertainty, and the number of digits is not always consistent. Furthermore, in those same supplementary figures, the slopes have the wrong units. In regards to these C6 and other figures, when statistical significance is mentioned in the text, that should be backed up with a statement of how it was determined. Such is not the currently the case in the manuscript, but it is critical, e.g., when discussing if oceanic pCO<sub>2</sub> is increasing more rapidly than atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> (Fig. S6).

*We have adopted the suggestions of the reviewer:*

*i) the numbers for the slope and uncertainty have been moved to tables, both in the manuscript and in the supplementary material*

*ii) we have made sure that the number of significant digits is consistent*

*iii) we have put in the right units*

*A description of how the statistical significance is calculated is now found at lines 225-227.*

d) Figs. 8 and 10 should be combined.

*Done*

e) Fig. 11 includes some details that might need to be deleted, and corresponding supplementary figures should also be refined. What is the rationale for including the dashed line and black stars in subsurface layers? Those layers have been isolated from the atmosphere for some time and we would not expect them to track atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. Showing these details in subsurface layers will confuse the reader. Moreover, would

it not be better to devote a separate figure just to the subject of ocean pCO<sub>2</sub> tracking atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> rather than trying to squeeze that information here into a very small space? Fig. S6 fills this need well. That could be brought up into the main paper. Only the top level (0-200 m) of Fig. S6 would need to be shown as we do not expect subsurface levels to track current levels of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. I also worry about how representative the 0-200 m layer is of surface ocean pCO<sub>2</sub>. Some discussion on that and perhaps a modified figure seems necessary.

*We agree that the dashed line and stars can lead to confusion, and we therefore removed them from the deep layers. After redoing the calculations and calculating the significance, we found that the trend is only significantly greater than the atmospheric one in two of the basins (NB and IS). We additionally tried to do the same for a thinner surface layer (0-50m), then the trend is only significantly greater in the NB. Initially, we thought that it was a good idea to bring the pCO<sub>2</sub> figure into the manuscript, but since we cannot state with any certainty that the trend is larger than that of the atmosphere, we do not think that it would fit in anymore, and would bring the reader away from the focus on pH.*

In corresponding supplementary figures for the model (Figs. S9-S11), the authors miss the opportunity to compare the model results over the same 1981-2019 period as used for the model.

*These figures have been removed in the revised version of the manuscript. Instead we made contour plots (maps and sections) showing the drivers associated with the modelled change, which we put in the main manuscript (Figs. 12 & 13). We think that these are more illustrative.*

*Regarding the suggestion about a comparison between the drivers in the model and observations, this was also suggested by reviewer 1:*

*The aim of this manuscript is to assess the acidification in the different time periods, using the best available data, and we do not attempt to compare the different periods per se. Such a comparison would thus not fill any function in the manuscript, with its current storyline. Further, an ESM is more adapted for long term studies of climate change stretching over a century, and not short-term studies. On the time scale of 40 years, climate variability can have an important impact on the observed changes, and the climate modes of an ESM are not in phase with the observed ones, which would complicate a comparison between observed and modelled changes.*

By the way, why is this time span often referred to in the text as lasting 40 years; actually, it lasts only 39 years.

*correct, we have corrected it in the manuscript*

My impression is that relative to the observations, the model is dominated even more by the change in DIC, based on the analogous plots for the previous and subsequent time periods. These supplementary figures concern the model, but readers will be confused because 'OBS' is used to designate the model result, both in the caption and in the figure itself. Please change 'OBS' to 'MOD'.

*These plots have been replaced by Figures 12 and 13 in the new manuscript.*

f) Fig. 12 has too much white space.

*We edited the figure to adjust for this.*

g) The supplementary figures are mentioned out of order.

*This has been corrected for.*