

Interactive comment on “Atmospheric carbon cycle dynamics over the ABoVEDomain: an integrated analysis using aircraft observations (Arctic-CAP) and model simulations (GEOS)” by Colm Sweeney et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 28 September 2020

The authors discuss recent aircraft observations of trace gases across Alaska and northern Canada and compare these observations against simulations from the GEOS model.

This manuscript is partly a data description paper, partly a model evaluation paper, and partly a paper on trace gas fluxes. I think that a data description paper and model development/evaluation paper would be better-suited for a different journal. At the conclusion of the study, I am not sure what new information we have learned about greenhouse gas sources and sinks from the region. This study seems to reiterate what

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



we already know – that greenhouse gases exhibit patterns in the atmosphere across North American high latitudes and that atmospheric models can reproduce at least some of these patterns.

Relatedly, I think this manuscript needs a more novel message. I do not think it is sufficient to describe patterns in aircraft observations across northern Canada and Alaska, nor is it sufficient to show that atmospheric models can reproduce at least some of the patterns in those observations. The authors argue that the analysis in this manuscript highlights the potential of the observations to inform surface fluxes, and the authors use a single set of flux estimates to evaluate this question. In fact, a number of studies have used aircraft and tower-based observations across high latitudes to inform surface fluxes (e.g., Pickett Heaps 2011, Chang et al. 2014, Karion et al. 2016, Miller et al. 2016, Zona et al. 2016, Commane et al. 2017, Hartery et al. 2018). Furthermore, existing studies have shown that models can capture spatial and temporal patterns in greenhouse gas fluxes at high latitudes (including models that use GEOS meteorology, e.g., Pickett-Heaps et al. 2011).

It would have been more interesting if the authors would have used these observations to inform surface fluxes instead of commenting on the possibility of doing so. For example, the authors could either estimate fluxes using aircraft observations or evaluate several bottom-up estimates of greenhouse gas fluxes (e.g., from recent bottom-up model inter-comparison projects like the Wetland And Wetland CH₄ Inter-Comparison Of Models Project (WETCHIMP), Multi-scale Synthesis and Terrestrial Model Intercomparison Project (MsTMIP), or TRENDY models).

Feedback on specific sections of the manuscript:

Introduction: To date, multiple studies have used atmospheric observations from Alaska and/or Canada to evaluate greenhouse gas fluxes across the region (e.g., Pickett Heaps et al. 2011, Chang et al. 2014, Karion et al. 2016, Sweeney et al. 2016, Zona et al. 2016, Miller et al. 2016, Hartery et al. 2018, Commane et al. 2017, Thomp-

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

son et al. 2017, Floerchinger et al. 2019). At present, the introduction does not cite any of these studies. I think it's important to cite at least a few of these references, explain what scientific questions these studies were able to answer, and point out which questions remain largely unanswered. The authors point out that top-down studies can be impacted by atmospheric transport errors, but the authors cite studies focused on other regions of the globe, not one of the many studies focused on Alaska and northern Canada.

Lines 195 - 240: The authors compare the magnitude of the bottom-up fluxes used in the GEOS model against a handful of recent studies. There are far more studies that have analyzed carbon dioxide and methane fluxes across the study region than described in the comparison here (see references in previous comments). This material also feels like it would be better suited for a results and/or discussion section; one could evaluate the magnitude of the fluxes using ABoVE aircraft observations and bring in existing studies to provide context on the results of this evaluation.

Section 2: At present, the methods section describes the aircraft flights and the GEOS model simulations, but the methods section does not describe any kind of analysis. I.e., based on the methods section, it is not clear what the authors intend to do with these aircraft observations or model simulations. I think this feeds into my previous comment that the manuscript needs a stronger purpose that drives toward a novel conclusion about greenhouse gas fluxes. I think that including analysis methods in this section would give the reader a stronger preview of where the manuscript is headed and what the authors intend to do with these data and model simulations.

Section 3.1.1: This section provides a broad description of the aircraft flights. I would start the results section by discussing a scientific result. The material in this section almost feels like it would be better suited for a methods section describing the frequency and locations of aircraft flights.

Line 376: Again, I think a number of studies focused on high latitudes have already

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

shown the utility of using aircraft observations to evaluate surface fluxes and surface flux models. I would try to ask more novel and focused questions either about the information content of existing atmospheric observations or about surface fluxes.

Minor comments: Line 169: Make sure to put the "2" in "CO₂" in subscript.

Figure 1: Why are the different flight tracks shown in different colors? What do those colors mean? This information is explained in the Figure 2 caption, but it would be useful to explain these features within the caption for figure 1 (or within a legend).

Figures 4 and 5: What is the takeaway message of this figure? I would recommend adding this information to the caption. Each of these figures contains many panels, and I was not sure what message I should take away as a reader.

Make sure to put the "2" and "4" in "CO₂" and "CH₄" in subscript throughout the references section.

References:

Chang, R. Y. W., Miller, C. E., Dinardo, S. J., Karion, A., Sweeney, C., Daube, B. C., Henderson, J. M., Mountain, M. E., Eluszkiewicz, J., Miller, J. B., Bruhwiler, L. M. P., and Wofsy, S. C.: Methane emissions from Alaska in 2012 from CARVE airborne observations, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 111, 16694-16699, 10.1073/pnas.1412953111, 2014.

Commane, R., Lindaas, J., Benmergui, J., Luus, K. A., Chang, R. Y. W., Daube, B. C., Euskirchen, E. S., Henderson, J. M., Karion, A., Miller, J. B., Miller, S. M., Parazoo, N. C., Randerson, J. T., Sweeney, C., Tans, P., Thoning, K., Veraverbeke, S., Miller, C. E., and Wofsy, S. C.: Carbon dioxide sources from Alaska driven by increasing early winter respiration from Arctic tundra, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 114, 5361-5366, 10.1073/pnas.1618567114, 2017.

Floerchinger, C., McKain, K., Bonin, T., Peischl, J., Biraud, S. C., Miller, C., Ryerson, T. B., Wofsy, S. C., and Sweeney, C.: Methane emissions from oil and

gas production on the North Slope of Alaska, *Atmospheric Environment*, 218, 10.1016/j.atmosenv.2019.116985, 2019.

Hartery, S., Commane, R., Lindaas, J., Sweeney, C., Henderson, J., Mountain, M., Steiner, N., McDonald, K., Dinardo, S. J., Miller, C. E., Wofsy, S. C., and Chang, R. Y.-W.: Estimating regional-scale methane flux and budgets using CARVE aircraft measurements over Alaska, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 18, 185–202, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-18-185-2018>, 2018.

Karion, A., Sweeney, C., Miller, J. B., Andrews, A. E., Commane, R., Dinardo, S., Henderson, J. M., Lindaas, J., Lin, J. C., Luus, K. A., Newberger, T., Tans, P., Wofsy, S. C., Wolter, S., and Miller, C. E.: Investigating Alaskan methane and carbon dioxide fluxes using measurements from the CARVE tower, *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 16, 5383–5398, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-16-5383-2016>, 2016.

Miller, S. M., Miller, C. E., Commane, R., Chang, R. Y. W., Dinardo, S. J., Henderson, J. M., ... & Sweeney, C.: A multiyear estimate of methane fluxes in Alaska from CARVE atmospheric observations. *Global biogeochemical cycles*, 30(10), 1441-1453, 2016.

Pickett-Heaps, C. A., Jacob, D. J., Wecht, K. J., Kort, E. A., Wofsy, S. C., Diskin, G. S., Worthy, D. E. J., Kaplan, J. O., Bey, I., and Drevet, J.: Magnitude and seasonality of wetland methane emissions from the Hudson Bay Lowlands (Canada), *Atmos. Chem. Phys.*, 11, 3773–3779, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-11-3773-2011>, 2011.

Sweeney, C., Dlugokencky, E., Miller, C. E., Wofsy, S., Karion, A., Dinardo, S., Chang, R. Y. W., Miller, J. B., Bruhwiler, L., Crotwell, A. M., Newberger, T., McKain, K., Stone, R. S., Wolter, S. E., Lang, P. E., and Tans, P.: No significant increase in long-term CH₄ emissions on North Slope of Alaska despite significant increase in air temperature, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 6604-6611, 10.1002/2016gl069292, 2016.

Thompson, R. L., Sasakawa, M., Machida, T., Aalto, T., Worthy, D., Lavric, J. V., Myhre, C. L., and Stohl, A.: Methane fluxes in the high northern latitudes for 2005-2013 esti-

mated using a Bayesian atmospheric inversion, *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 17, 3553-3572, 10.5194/acp-17-3553-2017, 2017.

Zona, D., Gioli, B., Commane, R., Lindaas, J., Wofsy, S. C., Miller, C. E., ... & Chang, R. Y. W.: Cold season emissions dominate the Arctic tundra methane budget. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(1), 40-45, 2016.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-2020-609>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

