

Prof. Daniel Cziczo
Co-Editor of Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics

Dear Dan,

5 Listed below are our responses to the second round of comments from Reviewer #1 of our manuscript. For clarity and visual distinction, the reviewer's comments or questions are listed here in black and are preceded by bracketed, italicized numbers (e.g. *[1]*). Authors' responses are in red below each referee statement with matching numbers (e.g. *[A1]*). We thank the
10 reviewer for carefully reading our manuscript and providing feedback to improve our manuscript.

Sincerely,

15 Allan Bertram
Professor of Chemistry
University of British Columbia

20 **Review for “Revisiting properties and concentrations of ice nucleating particles in the sea surface microlayer and bulk seawater in the Canadian Arctic during summer” by Victoria E. Irish et al.**

Anonymous Referee

25 The revised submission of “Revisiting properties and concentrations of ice nucleating particles in the sea surface microlayer and bulk seawater in the Canadian Arctic during summer” by Irish et al. has improved compared to the initial submission, but this is very little to bring it up to the standards of the journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics. My previous comments in
30 summary, were that there was insufficient scientific advancement in physics or chemistry to warrant publication. In this submission there are two new extensions beyond what was published in Irish et al.¹ which are i) oxygen isotopic fractionation and ii) a quantitative analysis of ice nucleating particles in air from a marine source. The isotope measurements adds to the study that terrestrial runoff and precipitation are correlated with the freezing temperature at
35 which 10% of droplets froze, T10. This correlation was better than for melting sea ice or seawater. To calculate the concentration of ice nucleating particles (INPs) in air, mass concentrations of sodium in ambient aerosol were used to scale their results. In total, the new findings compared to Irish et al.¹ were that INP concentrations were higher in 2016 than 2014 which are likely due to volume sampling differences, a correlation between calculated meteoric

and sea ice melt water fractions and T10, and back of the envelope calculations for INP concentrations in air. These extensions unfortunately do not apply any theory or give fundamental understanding in physics and chemistry and so I cannot recommend publication in the journal Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics which stresses exactly this. I warn the authors that if the editor allows for resubmission, much more work must be done in this regard to significantly shorten discussions that are already made in Irish et al.¹ while emphasizing any new discussion. Calculating correlations and up scaling data to the atmosphere is good but not sufficient for greater physical and chemical understanding.

Certainly, the measurements done on board a research vessel are very difficult, and there are now small extensions beyond the previous submission. These should be published, but I recommend elsewhere in literature. I would concede if the authors were restricted in time and submitted some months after the research cruise was over, then the benefit of the doubt would be given to publish exciting results as soon as possible. Was there some limitation in time or some issue with the data or paper that I should be unaware of when re-evaluating this manuscript?

Major Comments

[1] There remains an absence of testing any theory. This includes any chemistry, physics or thermodynamics. Free energy calculation for ice nucleation or critical ice embryo size is not calculated. Nucleation theories are not applied or tested. There is no evaluation on the transfer of particles from the bulk to the microlayer or into the air that uses physics or chemical transformation. Measurement of biological tracers are done, but only correlation is made without any other hypothesis testing.

The authors did not need to make more clear that they observed enhanced INP numbers in microlayer layer more in 2016 than in 2014 on l. 27-29. They needed to explain and give a physical-chemical reason as to why. Instead they only claim that ocean variability was the cause, or more likely than not it was an artifact of sampling a factor of 3 less in layer thickness 2016. This means that the microlayer concentrations in 2014 were simply diluted. It is true that the authors data make a comparison quantifying how the properties and concentrations of INPs have remained the same or have varied between these years, however, it does not answer the question of why. In general, the authors have not extended their manuscript enough and should choose a different journal that stresses measurements and data more.

[A1] Based on the Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics (ACP) website, ACP is dedicated to the publication and public discussion of high-quality studies investigating the Earth's atmosphere and the underlying chemical and physical processes. It covers the altitude range from the ocean surface up to the tropopause. The current study focuses on the properties and

concentrations of ice nucleating particles (INPs) in the sea surface microlayer and bulk seawater in the Arctic. We think this topic is relevant for ACP, since INPs from the Arctic Ocean are potentially an important source of INPs to the atmosphere and because the current manuscript includes estimates of concentrations of INPs in the Arctic marine boundary layer.

5
[2] The authors state that much of their results and data are consistent with Irish et al.¹. I had previously made the comment that the manuscript was too similar to their previous work, being about 30% identical to Irish et al.¹ and other material they published based on the iThenticate.com Similarity Report. Although the addition of oxygen stable isotopes and
10 calculation of airborne INPs will make this less similar, not enough was done to reword the rest of the manuscript. Therefore, my previous major comment that this manuscript is too similar to their previous is still warranted.

15 *[A2] We have gone back and modified text that was similar with Irish et al. 2017. After these modifications, 17% of the wording in the current document is identical to Irish et al. 2017, based on the Similarity Report from Copyleaks.com. However, almost all this overlap is due to similar references in both documents, which cannot be avoided because both manuscripts investigate INPs from the sea surface microlayer and bulk seawater. In addition, in the revised manuscript we have moved Figures 4 and 7 to the Supplement so that the figures in the*
20 *revised manuscript only emphasize new findings.*

Minor Comments

25 [3] • p.1, l.17 - The word choice is too negative. The way it was in the first version using the word "limited" better states that good work has been done and there is a need for more.

[A3] We have changed the wording back to "limited".

30 [4] • p.4, l.14-15 - The freezing temperature is not determined visually. The freezing is determined visually and the temperature is measured by an instrument at the same time it froze. Please reword this sentence.

[A4] We have re-worded this sentence to the following:

35 "The freezing temperature of each droplet was determined from the recorded videos and the temperature history of the cold stage." (Whale et al., 2015)."

[5] Please indicate in one sentence or so in section 2.2.1 how temperature was calibrated.

40 *[A5] We have added the following sentence to indicate how temperature was calibrated:*

"The temperature of the cold stage was calibrated by measuring the melting temperatures of dodecane (-9.57 °C) and octanol (-14.8 °C) (Whale et al., 2015)."

- 5 [6] • There is a section 2.1.1 but no section 2.1.2. There is no need to separate here. Please have only section 2.1.

[A6] We have made the suggested changes.

- 10 [7] • Description of blanks for the lab and field for different filtering are in different places, p.12 l.30 -p.13 l.2, p.13 l.14 - 16, p.17 l.3-7. Field blanks are discussed many times but found it hard when reading through the paper, where to locate their description. I recommend the authors dedicate a new short section to describe all the blanks one after another. This will help the reader refer back to the definition of the blanks.

- 15 [A7] *As suggested we have added a new short section to describe all the blanks one after another (see Section 2.2.2).*

- [8] • Another point about the field blanks. I understand that when seawater is filtered, freezing temperatures are much lower than field blanks. The procedure to make a field blank is first, to rinse all glassware and tubing for some time then second, sample and freeze drops of pure water that rinsed and flushed all glassware and tubing after the first rinse. Therefore, is it safe to say the purpose for field blanks is to evaluate the ability to reuse the same glass plate sampler and tubing to not cross contaminate between different stations? I think this is the case. It should be directly stated in the manuscript.

[A8] Yes, field blanks were used to assess cross contamination between different stations. This information has been added to the revised manuscript.

- 30 [9] • The short sentence on p.6 l.18 should be removed as it is a repeat of the previous.

[A9] This short sentence has been removed.

- 35 [10] • The phrase in situ was not used in the previous manuscript, but it is used in the revised version. However, an in situ chlorophyll measurement was not performed because the authors did not measure in water that remained in the ocean. Water was removed from the ocean. Samples of water were used for chlorophyll concentrations measurements. Please correct this.

- 40 [A10] *We have removed the term "in situ" from the manuscript.*

[11] • p.9 l.29 - The correlation coefficient of -0.83 and p value of 0.001 is exactly the same for both T10 and T50 in Tables 2 and S2. Is the a typo or coincidence?

[A11] This is coincidence.

[12] • p.10 l.4-8 - Deviation in freezing temperatures from those of constant a_w was observed only for ammonium containing solutes². Ammonia concentration in seawater should be on the order of micromolar and therefore should not affect freezing temperature in this way. This authors may wish to include this.

[A12] We have added this information to the revised manuscript.

[13] • p.10 l.12-14 Terrestrial runoff can also contain nutrients to grow marine microorganisms. After these nutrients are used up, cells can lyse, sink or their exudate can remain in surface waters. Then the source of INP may still be marine organisms. These sentences imply that terrestrial organisms in fresh water/lower salinity water are the major INP source, but this is only one possibility. The authors should include both.

[A13] Good suggestion. In the revised manuscript we have also discussed the possibility that terrestrial runoff could enhance the production of INPs in the ocean by providing nutrients for the growth of marine microorganisms.

[14] • What does “the upper end of the average values” mean on p.11 l.13? I have never heard of this measure before. Should the authors simply use the average of these 6 values?

[A14] To address the referee’s comment, we have changed “which is at the upper end of the average values mentioned above” to “which is within the range of the concentrations mentioned above”.

[15] • In Fig. 10, there are many conclusions missing that I hope the author would reconsider. First is that similar INP values per volume of air to previous literature is only seen for 2 or 3 stations, at temperatures for -10 to -5 C and more for microlayer samples than seawater samples. Could the authors state that a seawater source of ambient INP should be more important at warmer temperatures than for colder temperatures? At colder temperatures, there may be insignificant contribution of primary emission of INP from seawater. Would their other measurements such as filtering and heat treatment allow for the suggestion that these warm temperature INPs in ambient air may be from primary emission and also biogenic? Can the authors claim any evidence for a known aerosolized biogenic particle in the size range of 0.02–0.2 μm ? Is algal and bacterial exudate this size?

[A15] To address the referee’s comments, we have expanded our discussion of Fig. 10. Specifically we have included the following:

“Based on our freezing data, $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ ranges from $\sim 10^{-4} \text{ L}^{-1}$ to $< 10^{-6} \text{ L}^{-1}$ for freezing temperatures ranging from $-5 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $-10 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. Over this temperature range, the highest estimated values for $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ were associated with two microlayer samples, and only these two microlayer samples resulted in $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values as high as observed in direct atmospheric measurements of $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ in the marine boundary layer (Fig. 10) (DeMott et al., 2016; Irish et al., 2019). For freezing temperatures ranging from $-15 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $-25 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, our estimated $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values range from $>10^{-4} \text{ L}^{-1}$ to $< 10^{-6} \text{ L}^{-1}$. Over this temperature range, many of our samples result in $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values much less than observed in direct atmospheric measurements (Fig. 10). However, since our estimated $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values are limited to $\lesssim 2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ L}^{-1}$, we cannot determine if our most active samples result in $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values similar to direct atmospheric measurements for freezing temperatures of $-15 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $-25 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$.”

15 References

- [1] V. E. Irish, P. Elizondo, J. Chen, C. Chou, J. Charette, M. Lizotte, L. A. Ladino, T. W. Wilson, M. Gosselin, B. J. Murray, E. Polishchuk, J. P. D. Abbatt, L. A. Miller and A. K. Bertram, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 2017, 17, 10583–10595.
- [2] A. Kumar, C. Marcolli, B. Luo and T. Peter, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 2018, 18, 7057–7079.

Revisiting properties and concentrations of ice nucleating particles in the sea surface microlayer and bulk seawater in the Canadian Arctic during summer

Victoria E. Irish¹, Sarah J. Hanna¹, Yu Xi¹, Matthew Boyer², Elena Polishchuk¹, Mohamed Ahmed³,
5 Jessie Chen¹, Jonathan P. D. Abbatt⁴, Michel Gosselin⁵, Rachel Chang², Lisa A. Miller⁶, Allan K.
Bertram¹

¹ Department of Chemistry, University of British Columbia, 2036 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1, Canada

² Department of Physics and Atmospheric Science, Dalhousie University, Sir James Dunn Building, 6310 Coburg Road,
Halifax, Nova Scotia, B3H 4R2, Canada

10 | ³ Department of Geography, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive, Calgary, AB T2N 1N4, Canada

⁴ Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto, 80 St George Street, Toronto, Ontario, ON M5S 3H6, Canada

⁵ Institut des sciences de la mer de Rimouski, Université du Québec à Rimouski, 310 Allée des Ursulines, Rimouski, Québec,
QC G5L 3A1, Canada

⁶ Institute of Ocean Sciences, Fisheries and Oceans Canada, Sidney, BC V8L 4B2, Canada

15 *Correspondence to:* Allan Bertram (bertram@chem.ubc.ca)

Abstract. Despite growing evidence that the ocean is an important source of ice nucleating particles (INPs) in the atmosphere, our understanding of the properties and concentrations of INPs in ocean surface waters remain [limited](#). We have investigated INPs in sea surface microlayer and bulk seawater samples collected in the Canadian Arctic during the summer of 2016. Consistent with our 2014 studies, we observed that INPs were ubiquitous in the microlayer and bulk seawaters; heat and filtration treatments reduced INP activity, indicating that the INPs were likely heat-labile biological materials between 20 and 25 | 0.22 and 0.02 μm in diameter; there was a strong negative correlation between salinity and freezing temperatures; and concentrations of INPs could not be explained by chlorophyll *a* concentrations. Unique in the current study, the spatial distributions of INPs were similar in 2014 and 2016, and the concentrations of INPs were strongly correlated with meteoric water (terrestrial runoff plus precipitation). These combined results suggest that meteoric water may be a major source of INPs in the sea surface microlayer and bulk seawater in [this region, or meteoric water may be enhancing INPs in this region](#) [by providing additional nutrients for the production of marine microorganisms](#). In addition, based on the measured concentrations of INPs in the microlayer and bulk seawater, we estimate that the concentrations of INPs from the ocean in the Canadian Arctic marine boundary layer range from approximately 10^{-4} L^{-1} to $< 10^{-6} \text{ L}^{-1}$ at $-10 \text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$.

1 Introduction

30 Ice-nucleating particles (INPs) are atmospheric particles that catalyse the formation of ice crystals in clouds at warmer temperatures and lower vapour saturations than needed for homogeneous ice nucleation, thereby influencing cloud properties and potentially impacting the Earth's radiative properties and hydrological cycle (Boucher et al., 2013; Lohmann, 2002; Lohmann and Feichter, 2005; Tan et al., 2016). Only a small subset of atmospheric particles (about 1 in 10^6) act as

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:17 PM

Comment [1]: Addresses [3]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-22 10:15 AM

Deleted: insufficient

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:44 PM

Comment [2]: Addresses [13]

INPs (DeMott et al., 2010, 2016). INPs can catalyse the formation of ice by four different mechanisms: contact freezing, condensation freezing, deposition freezing, and immersion freezing. Immersion freezing, which is the focus of this paper, occurs when an INP immersed in a supercooled water droplet initiates freezing.

5 One potential source of INPs to the atmosphere is the ocean. Oceans dominate the Earth's surface coverage, and sea spray generates a large fraction of the aerosol mass in the atmosphere (Lewis and Schwartz, 2004). Several pieces of evidence suggest that the ocean is an important source of INPs to the atmosphere. For example, INPs have been measured in seawater and the microlayer (Fall and Schnell, 1985; Irish et al., 2017; Rosinski et al., 1988; Schnell, 1977; Schnell and Vali, 1975, 1976; Wilson et al., 2015) and in the air above the ocean (Bigg, 1973; Rosinski et al., 1986, 1987, 1988). Marine microorganisms and their by-products can also catalyse ice formation (Burrows et al., 2013; Knopf et al., 2011; Rosinski et al., 1987; Wilson et al., 2015). In addition, modelling studies have illustrated that INP concentrations from the ocean can be important when other sources of INPs, such as mineral dust, are low (Huang et al., 2018b; Vergara-Temprado et al., 2017; Yun and Penner, 2013). Sea spray aerosol is generated at the ocean surface (Blanchard, 1964) and varies considerably in composition, depending on the production mechanism. The production mechanism determines how much of the sea surface microlayer (herein referred to as the microlayer) compared to bulk seawater will be transferred to the sea spray aerosol (Wang et al., 2017). A recent study has shown that the ice nucleating ability of sub-micrometre particles formed from jet drops is more efficient than those formed from film drops (Wang et al., 2017).

10 Despite growing evidence that the ocean is an important source of INPs in the atmosphere, our understanding of the properties and concentrations of INPs in the microlayer and bulk seawater remain limited. For example, information on the spatial and temporal distributions of INPs in the microlayer and bulk seawater has not been investigated in sufficient detail. Nevertheless, this type of information is needed to improve predictions of INP emissions to the atmosphere from the ocean.

20 Recently, we reported the properties and concentrations of INPs in microlayer and bulk seawater samples collected in the Canadian Arctic during the summer of 2014 (Irish et al., 2017). We found INPs were ubiquitous in the microlayer and bulk seawater. Heat and filtration treatment of the samples indicated that the INPs were likely heat-labile biological materials with sizes between 0.02 and 0.22 μm in diameter. In addition, we found that the freezing activity of the microlayer and bulk seawater samples was inversely correlated with salinity, implying that the INPs were associated with melting sea-ice or terrestrial runoff. We also observed that the freezing temperatures of the microlayer samples were similar to those of the bulk seawater, in almost all cases.

30 Building on our previous studies, we returned to the Canadian Arctic during the summer of 2016 to further investigate the properties and concentrations of INPs in Arctic Ocean waters. Locations where samples were collected during both years are indicated in Fig. 1, and the detailed sampling dates and locations in 2016 are given in Table 1. By comparing results from 2016 with those from 2014, we investigate whether the properties, concentrations and spatial profiles of the INPs vary from year-to-year at similar locations. In addition, using stable isotopes of oxygen in the water molecules, we investigated further the possible importance of melting sea-ice and meteoric water (terrestrial runoff plus precipitation) to the

INP concentrations. Measured concentrations of INPs in microlayer and bulk seawater were also used to estimate concentrations of INPs in the Arctic marine boundary layer.

2 Experimental

2.1 Collection methods

5 During July and August of 2016 samples were collected from the eastern Canadian Arctic on board the CCGS *Amundsen* as part of the NETCARE project (Fig. 1 and Table 1). [Information recorded at each sampling station, are provided in Table S1.](#)

[In contrast to 2014,](#) when we collected microlayer samples manually using a glass plate sampler (Irish et al., 2017), in 2016, microlayer samples were collected using rotating glass plates attached to a sampling catamaran (Shinki et al., 2012).

10 At station 1, the sampling catamaran was deployed from a small boat at least 500 m away from the CCGS *Amundsen*. The sampling catamaran was remotely driven at least 20 m away from the small inflatable, rigid-hull boat before the rotating glass plates were activated remotely. A rotation rate of 10 revolutions per minute was used. From station 2 onwards, the remote control of the rotating glass plates on the sampling catamaran failed. Subsequently, the sampling catamaran was kept on the upwind side of the small inflatable, rigid-hull boat with its engine turned off, at least 500 m away from the CCGS

15 *Amundsen* to avoid contamination, and the glass plates were rotated manually between 11 to 18 revolutions per minute. The microlayer that adhered to the plates from each rotation was scrapped off with fixed Teflon wiper blades into a manifold and then pumped through Teflon tubing into high-density polyethylene (HDPE) Nalgene bottles (ranging from 250 mL to 2 L in volume). The thickness of the microlayer collected was approximately 80 µm based on the rotation rate (between 11 - 18 revolutions per minute), the average volume collected (3 L) and an average collection time (18 minutes). Bulk seawater

20 samples were collected at the same times and locations through Teflon tubing suspended 0.2 m below the sampling catamaran. The bulk seawater was pumped, using peristaltic pumps, into HDPE Nalgene bottles (ranging from 250 mL to 2 L in volume). After collection, the Nalgene bottles containing the microlayer and bulk seawater samples were kept cool in an insulated container. Upon returning to the ship, the samples were sub-sampled into smaller bottles for subsequent analyses.

25 The glass plates, aluminium manifold, Teflon tubing and all Nalgene bottles were sterilised first with bleach, then cleaned with isopropanol and finally rinsed with ultrapure water. After cleaning, the sampler was further rinsed by collecting then discarding microlayer and bulk seawater for approximately 2 minutes, before samples were retained.

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:22 PM

Comment [3]: Addresses [6]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:22 PM

Deleted: Information details recorded, including notes and photographs taken at each sampling station, are provided in Table S1. ... [1]

2.2 Ice nucleation properties of the samples

2.2.1 Droplet freezing technique and INP concentrations

INP concentrations were determined using the droplet freezing technique (DFT; Koop et al., 1998; Vali, 1971; Whale et al., 2015; Wilson et al., 2015). Sub-samples of the microlayer and bulk seawater were kept in 15 mL polypropylene tubes between 1 to 4 °C for a maximum of 4 hours before INP analysis.

In the freezing experiments three hydrophobic glass slides (Hampton Research, Aliso Viejo, CA, USA) were placed directly on a cold stage (Whale et al., 2015) and between 15 to 30 droplets of the sample, with volumes of 1 µL each, were deposited onto each of the glass slides using a pipette. A total of 45 to 90 droplets were analysed for each sample. A chamber with a webcam attached to the top of it was placed over the slides to isolate them from ambient air, and a flow of ultrapure N₂ was passed through the chamber as described by Whale et al. (2015). The droplets were cooled at a constant rate of 10 °C/min from 0 °C to -35 °C and the webcam recorded videos of the droplets during cooling. [The freezing temperature of each droplet was determined from the recorded videos and the temperature history of the cold stage \(Whale et al., 2015\).](#) [The temperature of the cold stage was calibrated by measuring the melting temperatures of dodecane \(-9.57 °C\) and octanol \(-14.8 °C\) \(Whale et al., 2015\).](#)

The concentration of INPs per unit volume of liquid, $[INP(T)]_{vol,liq}$, was determined from each freezing experiment using the following equation (Vali, 1971):

$$[INP(T)]_{vol,liq} = -\ln\left(\frac{N_u(T)}{N_o}\right)N_o \cdot \frac{1}{V}, \quad (1)$$

where $N_u(T)$ is the number of unfrozen droplets at temperature T , N_o is the total number of droplets used in the experiment, and V is the volume of all droplets in a single experiment. Equation 1 represents the concentrations of INPs active at temperature, T , and has been justified using Poisson's law (Vali, 1971). The use of Eq. 1 assumes that the concentration of INPs active at temperature T is independent of the cooling rate, which is a reasonable approximation for many atmospherically relevant INPs (Murray et al., 2011; Welti et al., 2012; Wheeler et al., 2015; Wright and Petters, 2013).

2.2.2. Field and laboratory blanks

Field blanks for the microlayer samples were prepared by running approximately 1 L of ultrapure water for approximately 1 minute over the glass plates, and through the manifold and tubing used to sample the microlayer. Field blanks for the seawater samples were prepared by running approximately 1 L of ultrapure water for approximately 1 minute through the tubing used to sample bulk seawater. These field blanks were used to evaluate cross contamination between different sampling stations. Laboratory blanks were prepared by passing ultrapure water a 0.22 µm filter.

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:21 PM

Comment [4]: Addresses [4]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:21 PM

Comment [5]: Addresses [5]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:24 PM

Comment [6]: Addresses [7]

2.2.3 Heating and filtration tests

The freezing temperatures of the microlayer and bulk seawater samples were also measured after they had been passed through syringe filters with three different pore sizes (Whatman 10 μm pore size PTFE membranes, Millex–HV 0.22 μm pore size PTFE membranes, and Anotop 25 0.02 μm pore size inorganic Anopore™ membranes) (Irish et al., 2017; Wilson et al., 2015). The samples were left for a maximum of 4 hours before filtration followed by INP analysis.

The freezing temperatures of the samples were also measured after they had been heated to 100 °C (Christner et al., 2008; Irish et al., 2017; Schnell and Vali, 1975; Wilson et al., 2015). In this case, samples were stored at -80 °C for less than 6 months and analysed in the laboratory at the University of British Columbia. Before heating the stored samples, they were completely thawed and homogenised by inverting at least ten times. The freezing temperatures were determined after heating the samples at 100 °C for approximately an hour. Separate experiments show that storage of the samples at -80 °C for a maximum of six months does not affect the INP concentrations (see Fig. S1 in the Supplement).

2.2.4 Corrections for freezing temperature depression

The measured freezing temperatures were adjusted for the depression of the freezing point by the presence of salts to generate freezing temperatures applicable to salt-free conditions (salinity = 0 g kg^{-1}), which is relevant for mixed phase clouds. In short, water activities of the samples were calculated from measured salinities using an Aerosol Thermodynamic Model (<http://www.aim.env.uea.ac.uk/aim/aim.php>; Friese and Ebel, 2010; Wexler and Clegg, 2002). Next, the water activity of an ice-salt solution at the median freezing temperature was calculated. The freezing temperature at salinity = 0 g kg^{-1} was then calculated from the difference in these two water activities following the procedure of Koop and Zobrist (2009).

The salinities of the microlayer and bulk seawater samples were measured within 10 minutes of sample collection using a hand-held salinity probe (SympHony; VWR, Radnor, PA, USA). The salinities (measured in practical salinity units (psu)) were corrected using a linear fit to salinometer (Guideline Autosol 8400 B) readings on parallel discrete samples. The correction for freezing point depression by the presence of salts based on the measured salinities ranged from 1.2 to 2.6 °C.

2.3 Bacterial and phytoplankton abundance

The abundances of heterotrophic bacteria and phytoplankton < 20 μm (i.e., phycoerythrin-containing cyanobacteria, phycocyanin-containing cyanobacteria and autotrophic eukaryotes) were measured by flow cytometry. Duplicate 4 mL subsamples were fixed with glutaraldehyde (Grade I; 0.12 % final concentration; Sigma-Aldrich G5882) in the dark at room temperature for 15 min, flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and then stored at -80 °C until analysis. Samples for heterotrophic bacteria enumeration were stained with SYBR Green I (Invitrogen) following Belzile et al. (2008) and counted with a BD

Accuri C6 flow cytometer using the blue laser (488 nm). The green fluorescence of nucleic acid-bound SYBR Green I was measured at 525 nm. Archaea could not be discriminated from bacteria using this protocol; therefore, hereafter, we use the term bacteria to include both archaea and bacteria with high nucleic acid (HNA) content and low nucleic acid (LNA) content. SYBR Green I stains all DNA and RNA, but bacteria and archaea are easily discriminated from other organisms (or detritus or transparent exopolymeric particles) by their size (side scatter) and fluorescence intensity. In addition, autotrophs stained with SYBR Green I are discriminated from heterotrophic bacteria by their chlorophyll *a* fluorescence.

Samples for < 20 µm phytoplankton abundances were analyzed using a CytoFLEX flow cytometer (Beckman Coulter) fitted with a blue (488 nm) and red laser (638 nm), using CytoExpert v2 software. Using the blue laser, forward scatter, side scatter, orange fluorescence from phycoerythrin (582/42 nm BP) and red fluorescence from chlorophyll (690/50 nm BP) were measured. The red laser was used to measure the red fluorescence of phycocyanin (660/20 nm BP). Polystyrene microspheres of 2 µm diameter (Fluoresbrite YG, Polysciences) were added to each sample as an internal standard (Marie et al., 2005; Tremblay et al., 2009).

2.4 Stable oxygen isotopes and water volume fractions

To investigate the possible importance of sea-ice melt and meteoric water (terrestrial runoff plus precipitation) to INP concentrations, we determined δ¹⁸O in the samples. Measurements of δ¹⁸O have been used in the past to distinguish between sea-ice melt and meteoric water in the Arctic Ocean (Alkire et al., 2015; Macdonald et al., 1995; Östlund and Hut, 1984; Tan and Strain, 1980). δ¹⁸O, a measure of the ratio of oxygen-18 (¹⁸O) to oxygen-16 (¹⁶O) in water molecules, is expressed as per mil (‰) deviations from Vienna Standard Mean Ocean Water (V-SMOW):

$$\delta^{18}\text{O} = \left(\frac{\left(\frac{{}^{18}\text{O}}{{}^{16}\text{O}} \right)_{\text{sample}}}{\left(\frac{{}^{18}\text{O}}{{}^{16}\text{O}} \right)_{\text{standard}}} - 1 \right) \times 1000 \text{‰}, \quad (2)$$

where standard corresponds to (V-SMOW). Samples were analysed at the GEOTOP-UQAM stable isotope laboratory at the Université du Québec à Montréal using the CO₂ equilibration method (Ijiri et al., 2003), where 200 µL of sample was equilibrated with CO₂ for 7 h at 408 °C. The CO₂ was then analysed on a Micromass Isoprime™ universal triple collector mass spectrometer in dual inlet mode with an AquaPrep™ system (Isoprime Ltd., Cheadle, UK). Two internal reference water samples (δ¹⁸O = -6.71 ‰ and -20.31 ‰) were used to normalise the sample data. Uncertainties in replicate measurements are ± 0.05 ‰ (1σ). δ¹⁸O-values were determined for all stations, except stations 1, 10, and 11.

From the measured δ¹⁸O values and measured salinities of the samples, the water volume fractions of sea-ice melt (*f_{SIM}*), water volume fractions of meteoric water (*f_{MW}*), and water volume fractions of seawater (*f_{sw}*) were calculated using the following conservation equations (Yamamoto-Kawai et al., 2005):

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:25 PM

Comment [7]: Addresses [9]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-22 11:06 AM

Deleted: The δ¹⁸O results are expressed in per mil (‰) deviations from V-SMOW.

$$f_{SIM}S_{SIM} + f_{MW}S_{MW} + f_{SW}S_{SW} = S_{obs} \quad (3)$$

$$f_{SIM}\delta^{18}O_{SIM} + f_{MW}\delta^{18}O_{MW} + f_{SW}\delta^{18}O_{SW} = \delta^{18}O_{obs} \quad (4)$$

$$f_{SIM} + f_{MW} + f_{SW} = 1 \quad (5)$$

where S represent salinity and the subscripts obs , SIM , MW , and SW represent observed, sea-ice melt, meteoric water, and seawater, respectively. For S_{SIM} , S_{MW} , $\delta^{18}O_{SIM}$, and $\delta^{18}O_{MW}$ we assumed 4 g kg^{-1} , 0 g kg^{-1} , 0.5 ‰ , -20 ‰ , respectively, in Eqs. 3-4 (Burgers et al., 2017). The values of S_{SW} and $\delta^{18}O_{SW}$ depend on the reference seawater chosen. In our studies the samples could have been influenced by either Arctic outflow waters ($S_{SW} = 33.1 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ and $\delta^{18}O_{SW} = -1.53 \text{ ‰}$) or west Greenland current waters ($S_{SW} = 33.5 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ and $\delta^{18}O_{SW} = -1.27 \text{ ‰}$) (Burgers et al. (2017)). When calculating f_{SIM} , f_{MW} , and f_{SW} values we used $S_{SW} = 33.3 \pm 0.2 \text{ g kg}^{-1}$ and $\delta^{18}O_{SW} = -1.40 \pm 0.13 \text{ ‰}$, which corresponds to average and limits for Arctic outflow waters and west Greenland current waters.

2.5 Chlorophyll a

Chlorophyll a concentrations for case 1 waters (waters dominated by phytoplankton) were retrieved from the GlobColour project website (<http://globcolour.info>, *ACRI-ST, France*). The GlobColour project provides a high resolution, long time series of global ocean colour by merging data from several satellite systems. The data used here include retrievals from either or both the Moderate Imaging Spectrometer (MODIS) on the Aqua Earth Observing System (EOS) mission and the Visible/Infrared Imager Radiometer Suite (VIIRS) aboard the Suomi National Polar-orbiting Partnership satellite. For this work we used data merged with weighted averaging, where weightings are based on the sensor and/or product. For more information regarding the weighted averaging refer to the GlobColour Product User Guide (http://www.globcolour.info/CDR_Docs/GlobCOLOUR_PUG.pdf). In this study 8-day data were used to achieve the best balance between spatial coverage ($1/24^\circ$, $\sim 4 \text{ km}$) and high time resolution. For the chlorophyll a concentration at a given sampling location, we used the grid cell corresponding to the location of that station. We determined the chlorophyll a concentration at all stations except station 8.

Chlorophyll a concentrations were also measured in collected samples of seawater. Samples were filtered onto Whatman GF/F glass-fibre filters, and Chlorophyll a concentrations were measured using a Turner Designs AU-10 fluorometer, after 24 h extraction in 90% acetone at 4°C in the dark (acidification method: Parsons et al. 1984).

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:25 PM

Comment [8]: Addresses [8]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:25 PM

Deleted: Chlorophyll a concentrations were also measured collected *in situ*. Samples for *in situ* chlorophyll a determination were filtered onto Whatman GF/F glass-fibre filters, and

3 Results and Discussion

3.1 Concentrations of INPs

The fraction frozen curves for all microlayer and bulk seawater samples measured in 2016 are shown in Fig. 2. Also shown for comparison are the fraction frozen curves of the samples after filtration through a 0.02 μm Anotop 25 syringe filter, the fraction frozen curves for the laboratory blanks (ultrapure water passed through a filter with a 0.22 μm pore size), and fraction frozen curves for field blanks (ultrapure water passed through the sampling catamaran). The laboratory blanks are at similar or warmer temperatures than the samples passed through a 0.02 μm Anotop 25 syringe filter. Differences are most likely due to the difference in pore sizes of the filters used: the laboratory blanks were passed through filters with a 0.22 μm pore size whereas the samples were passed through filters with a 0.02 μm pore size. Previous experiments in our laboratory have shown that ultrapure water passed through a filter with a 0.02 μm pore size can freeze at slightly colder temperatures than ultrapure water passed through a filter with a 0.22 μm pore size (Fig. S2).

For the bulk seawater, all untreated samples froze at temperatures warmer than the laboratory and field blanks. Freezing temperatures as warm as $-6\text{ }^\circ\text{C}$ were observed. These results indicate the presence of ice-active material in all bulk seawater samples. For the microlayer samples, all samples froze at temperatures warmer than laboratory blanks. In addition, most samples froze at temperatures warmer than the field blanks. These results also indicate that most microlayer samples contained ice-active material. For some of the samples, the freezing temperatures of the field blanks were warmer than the freezing temperatures of the samples. However, the freezing temperatures of the field blanks should be viewed as an upper limit to the background freezing temperatures, since prior to collecting the field blanks, the sampler had not been rinsed as thoroughly as before collecting the microlayer samples. For the remainder of this paper we will only show and discuss freezing data that were at warmer temperatures than the field blanks.

In Fig. 3 the concentrations of INPs, $[INP(T)]_{vol.liq}$, measured in 2016 are compared with concentrations measured in 2014 (sample locations for both years shown in Fig. 1). In both 2016 and 2014, the concentrations of INPs vary by at least 2 orders of magnitude at a given temperature, but warmer freezing temperatures were observed in 2016 compared to 2014.

Figure S3 shows the correlation between T_{10} -values (temperatures at which 10 % of the droplets froze) in the microlayer and bulk seawater samples from 2016. We focus on T_{10} -values to be consistent with our previous studies and because T_{10} -values of the samples were at warmer temperatures than the field blanks in almost all cases. Pearson correlation analysis was applied to compute correlation coefficients (r). P values were also calculated to determine the significance of the correlations at the 95 % confidence level ($p < 0.05$). A strong positive correlation ($r = 0.89$ and $p < 0.001$) was observed between the T_{10} -values of the microlayer and the T_{10} -values of the bulk seawater, consistent with our previous observations (Irish et al., 2017).

In 2016, 4 out of 9 samples had warmer T_{10} -values in the microlayer compared to bulk seawater (Fig. S3). However, in the 2014 samples, only 1 out of 8 samples had warmer T_{10} -values in the microlayer compared to bulk seawater (Irish et al., 2017). The difference between 2016 and 2014 may simply be due to year-to-year variations in the properties of

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:26 PM
Comment [9]: Addresses [2]

the microlayer relative to the bulk seawater related to variations in oceanic conditions. For example, Collins et al. (2017) documented differences in the activity of marine microbial communities between our 2016 and 2014 campaigns in the Canadian Arctic. In addition, the differences between 2016 and 2014 may be related to sampling techniques. In 2014 the glass plate technique collected a layer that was up to 220 μm thick. In contrast, in 2016 a thinner layer (approximately 80 μm thick) was collected. In the thicker layers collected in 2014, the microlayer INPs would have been diluted by bulk waters by roughly a factor of 2.8. Additional studies of how INP activity varies as a function of microlayer sample thickness are necessary to resolve this issue.

3.2 Effect of heating and filtering the samples

Figure S4 shows that the fraction frozen curves were shifted to colder temperatures after the microlayer and bulk seawater samples were heated to 100 °C. These results are similar to what we observed for the 2014 samples (Irish et al., 2017). This suggests that the ice-active material we found in the microlayer and bulk seawater samples was likely heat-labile biological material (Christner et al., 2008).

Figure S5 shows that the temperature at which droplets froze in microlayer and bulk seawater samples significantly decreased after the samples were passed through a 0.02 μm filter, but not through 10 μm or 0.22 μm filters. A similar result was observed in the 2014 samples (Irish et al., 2017), suggesting that the INPs in the microlayer and bulk seawater were between 0.22 μm and 0.02 μm in size.

3.3 Spatial distributions of INPs in the Canadian Arctic

The spatial distributions of T_{10} -values for bulk seawater samples in both 2016 and 2014 are shown in Fig. 4. The spatial distributions are similar for microlayer samples (Fig. S6). In each panel the colour scales have been adjusted to easily compare the general pattern of T_{10} -values between years. For both 2014 and 2016, the T_{10} -values for samples taken from northern Baffin Bay and Nares Strait between Greenland and Canada, above 75 °N, are generally lower than the T_{10} -values elsewhere. To further investigate the similarities in spatial patterns between 2014 and 2016, we compared T_{10} -values at sampling sites in close proximity for the two years (Fig. 5a). A strong positive correlation ($r = 0.93$, $p < 0.001$) was found between the T_{10} -values measured in 2014 and T_{10} -values measured in 2016 at those proximal locations (Fig. 5b), suggesting that the general spatial distribution of T_{10} -values measured in 2014 and 2016 were similar even though warmer freezing temperatures were observed in 2016 compared to 2014 (Fig. 3).

3.4 Correlations with biological, chemical, and physical properties of the bulk seawater

In Table 2 and Fig. S7, we present correlations between T_{10} -values for bulk seawater in 2016 and heterotrophic bacterial abundance, phytoplankton (including 0.2-20 μm photosynthetic eukaryotes and cyanobacteria) abundance, salinity, and temperature. The strongest correlation was with salinity ($r = -0.83$, $p \leq 0.001$). Similar correlations were observed for T_{50} -values (Table S2). One possible explanation for the negative correlation between T_{10} -values and salinity is a non-colligative effect of sea salt on the freezing temperature. For example, solutes can impact freezing temperature by blocking INP active sites (Kumar et al., 2018). To test this hypothesis, we varied the salinity in one of the microlayer samples (Station 4) by adding commercial sea salt (Instant Ocean™), while keeping the concentration of ice nucleating material in the samples constant (see Supplement Section S1 for more details). As the salinity of the sample was increased from 29 to 55 g kg^{-1} , the T_{10} -values for the salinity-enhanced samples (after correcting for freezing point depression) varied by less than the uncertainty in the measurements (Fig. S8 in the Supplement). These results suggest that sea salt does not have a non-colligative effect on the freezing temperature of the samples, at least not for the microlayer sample tested (Station 4). Consistent with these results, non-colligative effects have not been observed in previous studies of immersion freezing with seawater and sodium chloride solutions (Alpert et al., 2011a, 2011b; Knopf et al., 2011; Wilson et al., 2015; Zobrist et al., 2008). [Non-colligative effects have been observed in immersion freezing studies with ammonium containing salts, but these results are not likely relevant for seawater solutions \(Whale et al., 2018\).](#)

As suggested in our earlier study (Irish et al., 2017), another possible explanation for the negative correlation between salinity and freezing temperature is that the INPs are associated with either sea-ice melt or terrestrial runoff (including that from melting glaciers or permafrost). Melting sea-ice and terrestrial runoff have lower salinities than seawater. In addition, sea-ice melt and terrestrial runoff often contain microorganisms and their exudates, which can be especially effective INPs (Assmy et al., 2013; Boetius et al., 2015; Christner et al., 2008; Ewert and Deming, 2013; Fernández-Méndez et al., 2014). [Terrestrial runoff could also enhance the production of INPs in the ocean by providing additional nutrients for the growth of marine microorganisms.](#)

Figure 6 shows the T_{10} -values of bulk seawater as a function of the water volume fraction of meteoric water (f_{MW}) and water volume fraction of sea-ice melt (f_{SIM}) calculated using Eqs. 3-5. A strong positive correlation ($r = 0.91$, $p < 0.001$) was observed between T_{10} and f_{MW} in the samples. In contrast, the correlation between T_{10} and f_{SIM} in the samples was weaker and the p-value was close to 0.05 ($r = 0.63$, $p = 0.048$). [These combined results suggest that meteoric water \(terrestrial runoff plus precipitation\) may be a major source of INPs in this area, or alternatively meteoric water may be enhancing INPs in this area by providing additional nutrients for the production of marine microorganisms.](#) Terrestrial runoff has also been identified as a major source of INPs in temperate rivers and lakes (Knackstedt et al., 2018; Larsen et al., 2017; Moffett et al., 2018).

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:27 PM

Comment [10]: Addresses [2]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:34 PM

Comment [11]: Addresses [12]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:36 PM

Comment [12]: Addresses [13]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:39 PM

Comment [13]: Addresses [13]

3.4.1 Chlorophyll *a* correlations

Figure 7 shows correlations between the chlorophyll data retrieved from GlobColour and the T_{10} -values for the microlayer and bulk seawater. The correlations between T_{10} -values in the microlayer or bulk seawater and chlorophyll *a* are not statistically significant. Figure S9 shows the relationship between the measured chlorophyll *a* concentrations and the T_{10} -values for the microlayer and bulk seawater. Again, the correlations are not statistically significant. Our results from satellite and our measured chlorophyll *a* data are consistent with recent work by Wang et al. (2015), who showed that INP concentrations in sea spray aerosol emitted during a mesocosm tank experiment were not simply coupled to chlorophyll *a* concentrations.

3.5 Predictions of INP concentrations in the Arctic marine boundary layer

In the following, we provide an initial estimate of the concentration of INPs in the Arctic marine boundary layer based on our freezing results. First, we calculated the concentration of INPs in the liquid per unit mass of sea salt, $[INP(T)]_{mass,salt}$, using the following equation:

$$[INP(T)]_{mass,salt} = -\ln\left(\frac{N_u(T)}{N_o}\right) N_o \cdot \frac{1}{V\rho S} \quad (6)$$

where ρ is the density of water and S is the salinity of the seawater. Plots of $[INP(T)]_{mass,salt}$ as a function of temperature calculated from our freezing results are shown in Fig. S10. From $[INP(T)]_{mass,salt}$, the concentration of INPs per unit volume of air in the Arctic marine boundary layer, $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ was estimated with following equation:

$$[INP(T)]_{vol,air} = [INP(T)]_{mass,salt} \cdot c \quad (7)$$

where c is the concentration of sea salt in the Arctic marine boundary layer. Average concentrations of sea salt at Barrow, Alaska (71.3° N, 156.6° W), Alert, Nunavut, Canada (82.5° N, 62.5° W), and Zeppelin, Svalbard, Norway (78.9° N, 11.9° E) are 1.5, 0.1, and 0.6 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ in July, and 1.4, 0.1, and 0.5 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$ in August, respectively (Huang et al., 2018a). For these exploratory calculations we used a value of 1 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$, which is within the range of the concentrations mentioned above.

Shown in Fig. 8 are estimated values for $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ based on our freezing data and a concentration of sea salt in the Arctic marine boundary layer of 1 $\mu\text{g m}^{-3}$. Based on our freezing data, $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ ranges from $\sim 10^{-4} \text{ L}^{-1}$ to $< 10^{-6} \text{ L}^{-1}$ for freezing temperatures ranging from -5 °C to -10 °C. Over this temperature range, the highest estimated values for $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ were associated with two microlayer samples, and only these two microlayer samples resulted in $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values as high as observed in direct atmospheric measurements of $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ in the marine boundary layer (Fig. 8) (DeMott et al., 2016; Irish et al., 2019). For freezing temperatures ranging from -15 °C to -25 °C, our estimated $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values range from $> 10^{-4} \text{ L}^{-1}$ to $< 10^{-6} \text{ L}^{-1}$. Over this temperature range, many of our samples result in $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values much less than observed in direct atmospheric measurements (Fig. 8). However, since our estimated $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values are limited to $2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ L}^{-1}$, we cannot determine if our most active samples give $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ values

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:39 PM

Comment [14]: Addresses [10]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-22 7:33 PM

Deleted: in situ

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:39 PM

Comment [15]: Addresses [10]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-22 7:34 PM

Deleted: in situ

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:40 PM

Comment [16]: Addresses [14]

similar to direct atmospheric measurements for freezing temperatures of $-15\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $-25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. The following caveats should be kept in mind when interpreting Fig. 8: first, we did not consider the possible enrichment of INPs in sea salt aerosols compared to the microlayer or bulk seawater samples, which can result from the bubble bursting mechanism. Second, the concentrations of sea salt used to estimate $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ was likely an upper limit based on the previous measurements at Barrow, Alert and Zeppelin.

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:41 PM

Comment [17]: Addresses [15]

4 Summary and conclusions

The INP concentrations in microlayer and bulk seawater samples were determined at eleven stations in the Canadian Arctic during the summer of 2016 and compared to measurements made in 2014 (Irish et al., 2017). Filtration reduced the freezing temperatures of all samples, suggesting ice-active particulate material was universally present in the microlayer and bulk seawaters we studied. Some samples had freezing temperatures as high as $-5\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. Freezing temperatures also decreased after heat treatment, indicating that the ice-active material was likely heat-labile biological material, consistent with previous measurements of INPs in the microlayer (Wilson et al., 2015) and bulk seawater (Schnell, 1977; Schnell and Vali, 1975, 1976). The ice-active material we observed was between $0.22\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ and $0.02\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ in size, also consistent with previous studies of INPs in the microlayer (Wilson et al., 2015) and bulk seawater (Rosinski et al., 1986; Schnell and Vali, 1975).

We found similar spatial distribution of INPs in both years. In 2016, however, we observed generally higher concentrations of INPs nucleating ice at higher temperatures, particularly in the microlayer samples. This could, in part, be because we sampled a thinner microlayer in 2016, a hypothesis that could be tested by collecting microlayer samples using both collection methods in the same region at the same time. The observed differences could also simply be a result of variability in oceanographic conditions between the two expeditions.

We observed a strong positive correlation between T_{10} -values and the volume fraction of meteoric water in the bulk seawater samples. These results suggest that meteoric water may be a major source of INPs in Arctic coastal regions. Alternatively, meteoric water may be enhancing INPs in this area by providing additional nutrients for the production of marine microorganisms. Related, recent studies have measured high concentrations of INPs in freshwater sources such as rivers and lakes in other parts of the world (Knackstedt et al., 2018; Larsen et al., 2017; Moffett et al., 2018).

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:46 PM

Comment [18]: Addresses [13]

Exploratory calculations, using our freezing data, suggest that the concentrations of INPs from the ocean in the marine boundary layer range from $\sim 10^{-4}\text{ L}^{-1}$ to $< 10^{-6}\text{ L}^{-1}$ at $-10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. Furthermore, only the most active samples we studied gave calculated INP concentrations as high as observed in previous measurements of INPs in the marine boundary layer (DeMott et al., 2016; Irish et al., 2019). However, these exploratory calculations have caveats that need to be considered in future studies.

Data availability

Underlying material and related items for this manuscript are located in the Supplement.

Author contribution

AKB, JPDA, LAM, and VEI conceptualised the research. VEI, MB, MA, and RC collected the samples. SJH, YX, MG,
5 LAM, and MA provided additional data. VEI analysed the data. VEI, SJH, MG, LAM, and AKB wrote the publication. All
co-authors reviewed the paper.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

10

Acknowledgements

We thank the scientists, officers, and crew of the CCGS *Amundsen* for their support during the 2014 and 2016
expeditions; Lucius Perreault for land-based support with the microlayer sampler; Allison Lapin, Eugene Shen, and Hang
Nguyen for help with INP analyses; Joannie Charette, Aude Boivin-Rioux, and Claude Belzile for flow cytometry analyses;
15 and Tonya Burgers for help with $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ data collection, analysis, and interpretation. We would also like to thank the Natural
Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (the NETCARE project), Fisheries and Oceans Canada and ArcticNet
(Network of Centres of Excellence of Canada) for funding this work. GlobColour data (<http://globcolour.info>) used in this
study were developed, validated, and distributed by ACRI-ST, France.

20

References

- Alkire, M. B., Morison, J. and Anderson, R.: Variability in the meteoric water, sea-ice melt, and Pacific water contributions to the central Arctic Ocean, 2000-2014, *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.*, 120, 1573–1598, doi:10.1002/2014JC010023, 2015.
- Alpert, P. A., Aller, J. Y. and Knopf, D. A.: Ice nucleation from aqueous NaCl droplets with and without marine diatoms, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 5539–5555, doi:10.5194/acp-11-5539-2011, 2011a.
- Alpert, P. A., Aller, J. Y. and Knopf, D. A.: Initiation of the ice phase by marine biogenic surfaces in supersaturated gas and supercooled aqueous phases, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 19882–19894, doi:10.1039/c1cp21844a, 2011b.
- Assmy, P., Ehn, J. K., Fernández-Méndez, M., Hop, H., Katlein, C., Sundfjord, A., Bluhm, K., Daase, M., Engel, A., Fransson, A., Granskog, M. A., Hudson, S. R., Kristiansen, S., Nicolaus, M., Peeken, I., Renner, A. H. H., Spreen, G., Tatarak, A. and Wiktor, J.: Floating Ice-Algal Aggregates below Melting Arctic Sea Ice, *PLoS One*, 8, e76599–e76612, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0076599, 2013.
- Belzile, C., Brugel, S., Nozais, C., Gratton, Y. and Demers, S.: Variations of the abundance and nucleic acid content of heterotrophic bacteria in Beaufort Shelf waters during winter and spring, *J. Mar. Syst.*, 74, 946–956, doi:10.1016/j.jmarsys.2007.12.010, 2008.
- Bigg, E. K.: Ice Nucleus Concentrations in Remote Areas, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 30, 1153–1157, doi:10.1175/1520-0469(1973)030<1153:INCIRA>2.0.CO;2, 1973.
- Blanchard, D. C.: Sea-to-Air Transport of Surface Active Material, *Science*, 146, 396–397, 1964.
- Boetius, A., Anesio, A. M., Deming, J. W., Mikucki, J. A. and Rapp, J. Z.: Microbial ecology of the cryosphere: sea ice and glacial habitats, *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.*, 13, 677–690, doi:10.1038/nrmicro3522, 2015.
- Boucher, O., Randall, D., Artaxo, P., Bretherton, C., Feingold, G., Forster, P., Kerminen, V.-M., Kondo, Y., Liao, H., Lohmann, U., Rasch, P., Satheesh, S. K., Sherwood, S., Stevens, B. and Zhang, X. Y.: Clouds and aerosols, *Clim. Chang.* 2013 Phys. Sci. Basis Work. Gr. I Contrib. to Fifth Assess. Rep. Intergov. Panel Clim. Chang., 9781107057, 571–657, doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.016, 2013.
- Burgers, T. M., Miller, L. A., Thomas, H., Else, B. G. T., Gosselin, M. and Papakyriakou, T.: Surface water $p\text{CO}_2$ variations and sea-air CO_2 fluxes during summer in the Eastern Canadian Arctic, *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.*, 122, 9663–9678, doi:10.1002/2017JC013250, 2017.
- Burrows, S. M., Hoose, C., Pöschl, U. and Lawrence, M. G.: Ice nuclei in marine air: Biogenic particles or dust?, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 13, 245–267, doi:10.5194/acp-13-245-2013, 2013.
- Christner, B. C., Cai, R., Morris, C. E., McCarter, K. S., Foreman, C. M., Skidmore, M. L., Montross, S. N. and Sands, D. C.: Geographic, seasonal, and precipitation chemistry influence on the abundance and activity of biological ice nucleators in rain and snow., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 105, 18854–18859, doi:10.1073/pnas.0809816105, 2008.
- Collins, D. B., Burkart, J., Chang, R. Y. W., Lizotte, M., Boivin-Rioux, A., Blais, M., Mungall, E. L., Boyer, M., Irish, V. E., Massé, G., Kunkel, D., Tremblay, J. É., Papakyriakou, T., Bertram, A. K., Bozem, H., Gosselin, M., Levasseur, M. and

- Abbatt, J. P. D.: Frequent ultrafine particle formation and growth in Canadian Arctic marine and coastal environments, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 13119–13138, doi:10.5194/acp-17-13119-2017, 2017.
- DeMott, P. J., Prenni, A. J., Liu, X., Kreidenweis, S. M., Petters, M. D., Twohy, C. H., Richardson, M. S., Eidhammer, T. and Rogers, D. C.: Predicting global atmospheric ice nuclei distributions and their impacts on climate., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 107, 11217–11222, doi:10.1073/pnas.0910818107, 2010.
- DeMott, P. J., Hill, T. C. J., McCluskey, C. S., Prather, K. A., Collins, D. B., Sullivan, R. C., Ruppel, M. J., Mason, R. H., Irish, V. E., Lee, T., Hwang, C. Y., Rhee, T. S., Snider, J. R., McMeeking, G. R., Dhaniyala, S., Lewis, E. R., Wentzell, J. J. B., Abbatt, J., Lee, C., Sultana, C. M., Ault, A. P., Axson, J. L., Diaz Martinez, M., Venero, I., Santos-Figueroa, G., Stokes, M. D., Deane, G. B., Mayol-Bracero, O. L., Grassian, V. H., Bertram, T. H., Bertram, A. K., Moffett, B. F. and Franc, G. D.: Sea spray aerosol as a unique source of ice nucleating particles, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 113, 5797–5803, doi:10.1073/pnas.1514034112, 2016.
- Ewert, M. and Deming, J. W.: Sea Ice Microorganisms: Environmental Constraints and Extracellular Responses, *Biology (Basel)*, 2, 603–628, doi:10.3390/biology2020603, 2013.
- Fall, R. and Schnell, R. C.: Association of an ice-nucleating pseudomonad with cultures of the marine dinoflagellate, *heterocapsa niei*, *J. Mar. Res.*, 43, 257–265, 1985.
- Fernández-Méndez, M., Wenzhöfer, F., Peeken, I., Sørensen, H. L., Glud, R. N. and Boetius, A.: Composition, buoyancy regulation and fate of ice algal aggregates in the Central Arctic Ocean, *PLoS One*, 9, e107452–e107465, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0107452, 2014.
- Friese, E. and Ebel, A.: Temperature dependent thermodynamic model of the system $\text{H}^+\text{-NH}_4^+\text{-Na}^+\text{-SO}_4^{2-}\text{-NO}_3^-\text{-Cl-H}_2\text{O}$, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 114, 11595–11631, doi:10.1021/jp101041j, 2010.
- Huang, J., Jaeglé, L. and Shah, V.: Using CALIOP to constrain blowing snow emissions of sea salt aerosols over Arctic and Antarctic sea ice, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 16253–16269, 2018a.
- Huang, W. T. K., Ickes, L., Tegen, I., Rinaldi, M., Ceburnis, D. and Lohmann, U.: Global relevance of marine organic aerosol as ice nucleating particles, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 11423–11445, doi:10.5194/acp-18-11423-2018, 2018b.
- Ijiri, A., Tsunogai, U. and Gamo, T.: A simple method for oxygen-18 determination of milligram quantities of water using NaHCO_3 reagent, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108, 1472–1478, doi:10.1002/rcm.1081, 2003.
- Irish, V. E., Elizondo, P., Chen, J., Choul, C., Charette, J., Lizotte, M., Ladino, L. A., Wilson, T. W., Gosselin, M., Murray, B. J., Polishchuk, E., Abbatt, J. P. D., Miller, L. A. and Bertram, A. K.: Ice-nucleating particles in Canadian Arctic sea-surface microlayer and bulk seawater, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 10583–10595, doi:10.5194/acp-17-10583-2017, 2017.
- Irish, V. E., Hanna, S. J., Willis, M. D., Thomas, J. L., Wentzell, J. J. B., Cirisan, A., Si, M., Leitch, W. R., Murphy, J. G., Abbatt, J. P. D., Laskin, A., Girard, E. and Bertram, A. K.: Ice nucleating particles in the marine boundary layer in the Canadian Arctic during summer 2014, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 19, 1027–1039, 2019.
- Knackstedt, K., Moffett, B. F., Hartmann, S., Wex, H., Hill, T. C. J., Glasgo, E., Reitz, L., Augustin-Bauditz, S., Beall, B., Bullerjahn, G. S., Fröhlich-Nowoisky, J., Grawe, S., Lubitz, J., Stratmann, F. and McKay, R. M.: A terrestrial origin for

- abundant riverine nanoscale ice-nucleating particles, *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, *acs.est.8b03881*, doi:10.1021/acs.est.8b03881, 2018.
- Knopf, D. A., Alpert, P. A., Wang, B. and Aller, J. Y.: Stimulation of ice nucleation by marine diatoms, *Nat. Geosci.*, *4*, 88–90, doi:10.1038/ngeo1037, 2011.
- 5 Koop, T. and Zobrist, B.: Parameterizations for ice nucleation in biological and atmospheric systems., *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.*, *11*, 10839–10850, doi:10.1039/b914289d, 2009.
- Koop, T., Luo, B., Biermann, U. M., Crutzen, P. J. and Peter, T.: Freezing of HNO₃/H₂SO₄/H₂O Solutions at Stratospheric Temperatures: Nucleation Statistics and Experiments, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *101*, 1117–1133, doi:10.1021/jp9626531, 1997.
- Koop, T., Ng, H. P., Molina, L. T. and Molina, M. J.: A New Optical Technique to Study Aerosol Phase Transitions: The
- 10 Nucleation of Ice from H₂SO₄ Aerosols, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, *102*, 8924–8931, doi:10.1021/jp9828078, 1998.
- Kumar, A., Marcolli, C., Luo, B. and Peter, T.: Ice nucleation activity of silicates and aluminosilicates in pure water and aqueous solutions – Part 1: The K-feldspar microcline, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *18*, 7057–7079, 2018.
- Larsen, J. A., Conen, F. and Alewell, C.: Export of ice nucleating particles from a watershed, *R. Soc. Open Sci.*, *4*, 1–6, doi:10.1098/rsos.170213, 2017.
- 15 Lewis, E. R. and Schwartz, S. E.: Sea salt aerosol production: mechanisms, methods, measurements and models - a critical review, American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC., 2004.
- Lohmann, U.: A glaciation indirect aerosol effect caused by soot aerosols, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *29*, 1052, doi:10.1029/2001gl014357, 2002.
- Lohmann, U. and Feichter, J.: Global indirect aerosol effects: a review, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *5*, 715–737, doi:10.5194/acpd-4-7561-2004, 2005.
- 20 Macdonald, R. W., Paton, D. W., Carmack, E. C. and Omstedt, A.: The freshwater budget and under-ice spreading of Mackenzie River water in the Canadian Beaufort Sea based on salinity and ¹⁸O/¹⁶O measurements in water and ice, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *100*(C1), 895–919, 1995.
- Marie, D., Simon, N. and Vaultot, D.: Phytoplankton cell counting by flow cytometry, in *Algal Culturing Techniques*, edited by R. A. Anderson, pp. 253–267, Academic Press, London., 2005.
- 25 Moffett, B. F., Hill, T. C. J. and DeMott, P. J.: Abundance of Biological Ice Nucleating Particles in the Mississippi and Its Major Tributaries, *Atmosphere (Basel)*, *9*, 307, doi:10.3390/atmos9080307, 2018.
- Murray, B. J., Broadley, S. L., Wilson, T. W., Atkinson, J. D. and Wills, R. H.: Heterogeneous freezing of water droplets containing kaolinite particles, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, *11*, 4191–4207, doi:10.5194/acp-11-4191-2011, 2011.
- 30 Östlund, H. G. and Hut, G.: Arctic Ocean water mass balance from isotope data, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *89*, 6373–6381, 1984.
- Parsons, T. R., Maita, Y. and Lalli, C. M.: *A Manual of Chemical and Biological Methods for Seawater Analysis*, Pergamon Press, Oxford., 1984.
- Rosinski, J., Haagenson, P. L., Nagamoto, C. T. and Parungo, F.: Ice-forming nuclei of maritime origin, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, *17*, 23–46, doi:10.1016/0021-8502(86)90004-2, 1986.

- Rosinski, J., Haagenson, P. L., Nagamoto, C. T. and Parungo, F.: Nature of ice-forming nuclei in marine air masses, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 18, 291–309, doi:10.1016/0021-8502(87)90024-3, 1987.
- Rosinski, J., Haagenson, P. L., Nagamoto, C. T., Quintana, B., Parungo, F. and Hoyt, S. D.: Ice-forming nuclei in air masses over the Gulf of Mexico, *J. Aerosol Sci.*, 19, 539–551, 1988.
- 5 Schnell, R. C.: Ice Nuclei in Seawater, Fog Water and Marine Air off the Coast of Nova Scotia: Summer 1975, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 34, 1299–1305, 1977.
- Schnell, R. C. and Vali, G.: Freezing nuclei in marine waters, *Tellus*, 27, 321–323, doi:10.3402/tellusa.v27i3.9911, 1975.
- Schnell, R. C. and Vali, G.: Biogenic Ice Nuclei: Part I. Terrestrial and Marine Sources, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 33, 1554–1564, doi:10.1175/1520-0469(1976)033<1554:BINPIT>2.0.CO;2, 1976.
- 10 Shinki, M., Wendeborg, M., Vagle, S., Cullen, J. T. and Hore, D. K.: Characterization of adsorbed microlayer thickness on an oceanic glass plate sampler, *Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods*, 10, 728–735, doi:10.4319/lom.2012.10.728, 2012.
- Tan, F. C. and Strain, P. M.: The distribution of sea ice meltwater in the eastern Canadian Arctic, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 85(C4), 1925–1932, doi:10.1029/JC085iC04p01925, 1980.
- Tan, I., Storelvmo, T. and Zelinka, M. D.: Observational constraints on mixed-phase clouds imply higher climate sensitivity, *Science*, 352, 224–227, doi:10.1126/science.aad5300, 2016.
- 15 Tremblay, G., Belzile, C., Gosselin, M., Poulin, M., Roy, S. and Tremblay, J. É.: Late summer phytoplankton distribution along a 3500 km transect in Canadian Arctic waters: Strong numerical dominance by picoeukaryotes, *Aquat. Microb. Ecol.*, 54, 55–70, doi:10.3354/ame01257, 2009.
- Vali, G.: Quantitative Evaluation of Experimental Results on the Heterogeneous Freezing Nucleation of Supercooled Liquids, *J. Atmos. Sci.*, 28, 402–409, 1971.
- 20 Vergara-Temprado, J., Murray, B. J., Wilson, T. W., O’Sullivan, D., Browse, J., Pringle, K. J., Ardon-Dryer, K., Bertram, A. K., Burrows, S. M., Ceburnis, D., DeMott, P. J., Mason, R. H., O’Dowd, C. D., Rinaldi, M. and Carslaw, K. S.: Contribution of feldspar and marine organic aerosols to global ice nucleating particle concentrations, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 17, 3637–3658, doi:10.5194/acp-2016-822, 2017.
- 25 Wang, X., Sultana, C. M., Trueblood, J., Hill, T. C. J., Malfatti, F., Lee, C., Laskina, O., Moore, K. A., Beall, C. M., McCluskey, C. S., Cornwell, G. C., Zhou, Y., Cox, J. L., Pendergraft, M. A., Santander, M. V., Bertram, T. H., Cappa, C. D., Azam, F., DeMott, P. J., Grassian, V. H. and Prather, K. A.: Microbial Control of Sea Spray Aerosol Composition: A Tale of Two Blooms, *ACS Cent. Sci.*, 1, 124–131, doi:10.1021/acscentsci.5b00148, 2015.
- Wang, X., Deane, G. B., Moore, K. A., Ryder, O. S., Stokes, M. D., Beall, C. M., Collins, D. B., Santander, M. V., Burrows, S. M., Sultana, C. M. and Prather, K. A.: The role of jet and film drops in controlling the mixing state of submicron sea spray aerosol particles., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 114, 6978–6983, doi:10.1073/pnas.1702420114, 2017.
- 30 Welti, A., Lüönd, F., Kanji, Z. A., Stetzer, O. and Lohmann, U.: Time dependence of immersion freezing: An experimental study on size selected kaolinite particles, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 12, 9893–9907, doi:10.5194/acp-12-9893-2012, 2012.
- Wexler, A. S. and Clegg, S. L.: Atmospheric aerosol models for systems including the ions H^+ , NH_4^+ , Na^+ , SO_4^{2-} , NO_3^- , Cl^- ,

- Br⁻, and H₂O, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 107, 4207–4221, doi:10.1029/2001JD000451, 2002.
- Whale, T. F., Murray, B. J., O’Sullivan, D., Wilson, T. W., Umo, N. S., Baustian, K. J., Atkinson, J. D., Workneh, D. A. and Morris, G. J.: A technique for quantifying heterogeneous ice nucleation in microlitre supercooled water droplets, *Atmos. Meas. Tech.*, 8, 2437–2447, doi:10.5194/amt-8-2437-2015, 2015.
- 5 Whale, T. F., Sullivan, D. O., Holden, M. A., Wilson, T. W. and Murray, B. J.: The enhancement and suppression of immersion mode heterogeneous ice-nucleation by solutes, *Chem. Sci.*, 9, 4142–4151, doi:10.1039/c7sc05421a, 2018.
- Wheeler, M. J., Mason, R. H., Steunenberg, K., Wagstaff, M., Chou, C. and Bertram, A. K.: Immersion freezing of supermicron mineral dust particles: Freezing results, testing different schemes for describing ice nucleation, and ice nucleation active site densities, *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 119, 4358–4372, doi:10.1021/jp507875q, 2015.
- 10 Wilson, T. W., Ladino, L. A., Alpert, P. A., Breckels, M. N., Brooks, I. M., Browse, J., Burrows, S. M., Carslaw, K. S., Huffman, J. A., Judd, C., Kilhau, W. P., Mason, R. H., McFiggans, G., Miller, L. A., Nájera, J. J., Polishchuk, E., Rae, S., Schiller, C. L., Si, M., Vergara-Temprado, J., Whale, T. F., Wong, J. P. S., Wurl, O., Yakobi-Hancock, J. D., Abbatt, J. P. D., Aller, J. Y., Bertram, A. K., Knopf, D. A. and Murray, B. J.: A marine biogenic source of atmospheric ice-nucleating particles, *Nature*, 525, 234–238, doi:10.1038/nature14986, 2015.
- 15 Wright, T. P. and Petters, M. D.: The role of time in heterogeneous freezing nucleation, *J. Geophys. Res. Atmos.*, 118, 3731–3743, doi:10.1002/jgrd.50365, 2013.
- Yamamoto-Kawai, M., Tanaka, N. and Pivovarov, S.: Freshwater and brine behaviors in the Arctic ocean deduced from historical data of δ¹⁸O and alkalinity (1929-2002 A.D.), *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.*, 110, C10003, doi:10.1029/2004JC002793, 2005.
- 20 Yun, Y. and Penner, J. E.: An evaluation of the potential radiative forcing and climatic impact of marine organic aerosols as heterogeneous ice nuclei, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 40, 4121–4126, doi:10.1002/grl.50794, 2013.
- Zobrist, B., Marcolli, C., Peter, T. and Koop, T.: Heterogeneous ice nucleation in aqueous solutions: the role of water activity., *J. Phys. Chem. A*, 112, 3965–75, doi:10.1021/jp7112208, 2008.

25

Station number	Sampling start time (UTC)	Location
Station 1	20 th July 2016 18:30	60°17.921N 062°10.750W
Station 2	28 th July 2016 15:30	67°23.466N 063°22.067W
Station 3	1 st August 2016 13:30	71°17.200N 070°30.236W
Station 4	6 th August 2016 13:30	76°20.341N 071°11.418W
Station 5	8 th August 2016 11:00	76°43.777N 071°47.267W
Station 6	9 th August 2016 14:30	76°18.789N 075°42.963W
Station 7	11 th August 2016 17:00	77°47.213N 076°29.841W
Station 8	13 th August 2016 10:30	81°20.041N 062°40.774W
Station 9	15 th August 2016 14:00	78°18.659N 074°33.757W
Station 10	21 st August 2016 10:00	68°19.199N 100°49.010W
Station 11	23 rd August 2016 10:30	68°58.699N 105°30.022W

Table 1. Sampling times and geographic coordinates for the eleven stations investigated.

	Bulk T ₁₀ -value		
	r	p	n
Heterotrophic bacterial abundance	-0.77	0.003	11
Total phytoplankton abundance (0.2 - 20 µm)	0.19	0.287	11
Salinity	-0.83	0.001	11
Temperature	0.20	0.285	10

Table 2. Correlations between biological and physical properties of bulk seawater and T₁₀-values for 2016. Values in bold indicate results that are statistically significant.





Figure 1. Map showing locations of microlayer and bulk seawater sampling in 2014 (pink) and 2016 (light blue with specific station numbers in black).



5 **Figure 2.** Fraction of droplets frozen (in the immersion mode) versus temperature for (a) the microlayer, and (b) bulk seawater. Each line shows the results for 3 replicate experiments of a sample or a sample passed through a 0.02 μm filter, with a total of between 45 to 60 freezing events in each set. Each data point corresponds to a single freezing event in the experiments. Also included are the laboratory blanks (ultrapure water passed through a 0.22 μm filter), and the field blanks (ultrapure water sampled through the sampling catamaran). All microlayer and bulk seawater freezing points were corrected for freezing point depression to account for dissolved salts in seawater (Section 2.2.3). The uncertainty in temperature is ± 0.3 $^{\circ}\text{C}$.




Figure 3. Comparison of the concentrations of INPs, $[INP(T)]_{vol,liq}$, in (a) the microlayer and (b) bulk seawater samples from the 2014 (pink squares) and 2016 (blue triangles) studies. All data were corrected for freezing point depression. Error bars represent the statistical uncertainty due to the limited number of nucleation events observed in the freezing experiments (Koop et al., 1997). Only freezing data that was at warmer temperatures than the field blanks are included.





Figure 4. Spatial distributions of T_{10} -values in (a) 2016 and (b) 2014 for bulk seawater.

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:20 PM

Comment [19]: Addresses [2]

Victoria Irish 2019-4-29 5:12 PM



Deleted:

... [2]

Unknown

Formatted: Font:Bold







Figure 5. (a) Map showing regions of similar sampling locations in 2014 (pink) and in 2016 (blue). Sampling sites in 2014 that were near sampling sites in 2016 were paired together (indicated with boxes in the figure) and assigned letters A-F. Although there are two stations in box A for 2016, we only used data for the station that was closest to the one in 2014. (b) Relationships between T_{10} -values for microlayer and bulk seawater samples in 2014 and 2016 for similar sampling locations. The letters plotted in (b) indicate the locations in (a). Red letters represent bulk seawater data and blue letters represent microlayer data. Only freezing data that was at warmer temperatures than the field blanks are included.



Deleted:

Unknown

Formatted: Font:9 pt

5 **Figure 6.** Relationships between T_{10} -values for bulk seawater and (a) the water volume fractions for meteoric water, f_{MW} , and (b) the water volume fractions for sea-ice melt, f_{SIM} . The x-error bars are due to the uncertainties in seawater salinities and seawater $\delta^{18}O$ values used for calculating f_{MW} and f_{SIM} . For further details see Section 2.4. The y-error bars correspond to the 95% confidence interval for three repeat experiments.




Figure 7. Relationship between satellite-derived chlorophyll *a* concentrations, and the T₁₀-values of microlayer and bulk seawater for 2016. Only freezing data that was at warmer temperatures than the field blanks are included.




Figure 8. Plot of calculated $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ as a function of temperature based on our freezing data and an assumed sea salt aerosol concentration of $1 \mu\text{g m}^{-3}$. Also included are measured $[INP(T)]_{vol,air}$ from several recent field campaigns in the marine boundary layer reported in DeMott et al. (2016) and Irish et al. (2019). Only freezing data that was at warmer temperatures than the field blanks are included.