Variability of North Atlantic CO$_2$ fluxes for the 2000–2017 period
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Abstract. We present new estimates of the regional North Atlantic (15˚N–80˚N) CO$_2$ flux for the 2000–2017 period using atmospheric CO$_2$ measurements from the NOAA long term surface site network in combination with an atmospheric data assimilation system (GEOSChem–LETKF). We also assess the sensitivity of flux estimates to the representation of the prior ocean flux distribution and to the associated specification of prior flux uncertainty, including a specification that is dependent on the agreement among the multiple representations of the prior ocean flux. Long term average flux estimates for the 2000–2017 period are -0.26±0.04 PgC y$^{-1}$ for the subtropical basin (15˚N–50˚N), and -0.25±0.04 PgC y$^{-1}$ for the subpolar region (50˚N–80˚N, west of 20˚E). Our basin–scale estimates of the standard deviation of interannual variability (IAV) are 0.037±0.006 PgC y$^{-1}$ and 0.025±0.009 PgC y$^{-1}$ for subtropical and subpolar regions respectively. We find a statistically significant trend in carbon uptake for the subtropical North Atlantic of -0.062±0.009 PgC y$^{-1}$ decade$^{-1}$ over this period.

1 Introduction

The ocean plays a key role in the global carbon budget, accounting for 2.5±0.6 PgC y$^{-1}$ (approximately 26%) of the uptake of global fossil emissions during the last decade (period 2009-2018) (Friedlingstein et al., 2019). The North Atlantic ocean has been identified a region of significant net oceanic CO$_2$ uptake in a range of recent analyses (Schuster et al., 2013, Landschützer et al., 2013, Lebehot et al., 2019), and also the location of the largest Northern Hemisphere uptake of anthropogenic CO$_2$ in recent decades (Gruber et al., 2019, Khatiwala et al., 2013, Sabine et al., 2004). Recent estimates of net air-sea CO$_2$ fluxes derived from sea surface partial pressure CO$_2$ measurements (pCO$_2$) indicate net annual uptake for the North Atlantic of -0.47 ±0.08 PgC y$^{-1}$ for the 1990–2009 period (Schuster et al., 2013, equivalent to about 20% of global ocean CO$_2$ uptake). Regionally aggregated air-sea CO$_2$ fluxes over the North Atlantic basin also display significant variability on interannual (Watson et al., 2009) and decadal timescales (Landschützer et al., 2016, 2019). Based on analyses of surface pCO$_2$ measurements, variations in regional pCO$_2$ trends were observed in the subtropical and subpolar regions, potentially associated with large–scale climate oscillations such as the North Atlantic Oscillation and the Atlantic Multi–decadal Variation (McKinley et al., 2011, Landschützer et al., 2019, Macovei et al., 2020). Devries et al. (2019) estimated a negative trend in...
North Atlantic CO₂ uptake based on analysis of pCO₂-based estimates and ocean models for the 2000–2009 period. In addition, Lebehot et al. (2019) found distinct differences between trends in surface ocean CO₂ fugacity (fCO₂) derived from observation-based surface mapping methods and those from the CMIP5 Earth System models. These recent analyses of North Atlantic air-sea CO₂ fluxes have primarily been based on ‘bottom–up’ methods of varying complexity which use interpolated surface ocean pCO₂ distributions (derived from in-situ pCO₂ measurements) in combination with parameterizations of air–sea gas exchange (e.g., Landschützer et al., 2013; Rödenbeck et al., 2015; Takahashi et al., 2002; Takahashi et al., 2009). Estimates of air–sea CO₂ fluxes have also been derived by alternative methods such as global ocean biogeochemical models (e.g., Buitenhuis et al., 2013; Law et al., 2017), and ‘top–down’ methods which involve the application of inverse analyses or data assimilation methods to atmospheric and oceanic CO₂ measurements (e.g., Gruber et al., 2009, Mikaloff–Fletcher et al., 2006, Gurney et al., 2003, Peylin et al., 2013). Atmospheric CO₂ inversions estimate surface CO₂ fluxes by using information on observed gradients in atmospheric CO₂ together with atmospheric transport constraints (typically from 3 D atmospheric models) and prior information on surface CO₂ flux distributions (Rödenbeck et al., 2003; van der Laan–Luijkx et al., 2017; Peters et al., 2005; Peylin et al., 2013; Chevallier et al., 2014; Gaubert et al., 2019). Previous studies have noted some discrepancies between estimates of regional ocean fluxes from the different methods. For example, Peylin et al. (2013) noted the limited constraints provided by atmospheric CO₂ measurements on land–ocean carbon flux partitioning for some regions, and noted the potential for “flux leakage” between land and ocean flux estimates (e.g., the northern ocean fluxes). Previous studies also found that estimates of carbon fluxes from the atmospheric inverse method are sensitive to the specification of the prior flux distribution and its associated uncertainty distribution (Carouge et al., 2010; Chatterjee et al., 2013; Peylin et al., 2013). While there have been recent studies evaluating the sensitivity of land–based carbon flux estimates to specification of the prior flux and its uncertainty, the variation of regional ocean fluxes has been far less examined by previous inverse studies.

Previous inverse estimates of ocean CO₂ fluxes have predominantly relied on the climatological ocean to atmosphere CO₂ flux distribution of Takahashi et al. (2009) for use as the a priori flux estimate (e.g., Nassar et al., 2011; Feng et al., 2009, 2016; Deng et al., 2016). These analyses often use different methods to specify the level of flux uncertainty assigned to the ocean prior fluxes. For example, the inverse analyses of Feng et al. (2016) and Deng et al. (2016) use prior flux uncertainty levels of 0.6 PgC y⁻¹ (equivalent to 44% of the ocean flux total), i.e., a level of uncertainty twice as large as the uncertainty in Nassar et al. (2011).

Here we present a new long term estimate of North Atlantic air–sea CO₂ fluxes for recent decades (period 2000–2017) using atmospheric inverse methods. We use the carbon cycle data assimilation system GEOSChem–LETKF (GCL) which combines the global atmospheric CO₂ transport model GEOS–Chem (Nassar et al., 2010) with the Localized Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter (LETKF) data assimilation system (Hunt et al., 2007; Miyoshi et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2019). An additional focus of our analysis is to evaluate the sensitivity of flux estimates to alternative a priori flux distributions and uncertainty specifications for oceanic CO₂ fluxes. To our knowledge these influences on North Atlantic flux estimates have not been assessed previously.
We investigate the sensitivity of the derived posterior flux estimates to three different representations of the ocean prior flux distribution and investigate an alternative method to characterize prior ocean flux uncertainty based on the ensemble spread of the multiple prior ocean fluxes. We derive North Atlantic CO$_2$ flux estimates for the 2000–2017 period and compare their characteristics with previous relevant studies.

2 Materials and Methods

2.1 Overview

Our analysis employs the Localised Ensemble Kalman Filter (section 2.2) together with the global GEOS-Chem atmospheric chemistry transport model (section 2.3) and atmospheric CO$_2$ observations from the NOAA–ESRL network of surface sites (section 2.4). Section 2.5 describes the specification of flux uncertainty based on multiple representations of prior ocean fluxes (spread–based uncertainty). Section 2.6 presents sensitivity analyses assessing different prior flux representations and flux uncertainties defined from three different schemes (i.e., percentage–based uncertainty specifications (60%, 120%), and the spread–based uncertainty scheme). Further details on the methods, model, observations and uncertainty calculations are presented in the sections below and in the Appendix.

2.2 Localized Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter (LETKF)

The LETKF is a data assimilation system which provides an estimate given a prior (or “background”) estimate of the current state based on past and current data (in this case, the atmospheric CO$_2$ mole fraction observations). The general framework of the LETKF is described in Hunt et al. (2007); it has been adapted by Miyoshi et al. (2007) to provide gridscale localized analysis of flux estimates. The LETKF system has been used to estimate CO$_2$ fluxes in a range of previous studies (e.g, Kang et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2016, 2019).

The LETKF provides iterative estimates of the time evolution of the system state, $x$, (here representing the gridscale surface carbon fluxes). Each step involves a forecast stage (based on a physical model of the system evolution) and a state estimation stage (the ‘analysis’ step), which combines system observations, $y$, together with the background forecast, $x^b$, to derive the improved state estimate. The observation operator $H$ provides the mapping from the state space to the observation space; in this study $H$ is provided by the GEOS–Chem atmospheric model (section 2.3). Further details on the LETKF and the governing equations for flux estimation are provided in the Appendix A1.

In this analysis, the LETKF is used to derive gridscale fluxes for the period 2000–2017. The gridded fluxes are updated sequentially on weekly timescale by assimilation of the atmospheric CO$_2$ observations from a network of surface sites (section...
2.4) We report a posteriori fluxes on monthly timescales for the 2000–2017 period; the optimized monthly fluxes are derived from four sequential weeks of assimilation cycles.

2.3 The GEOS–Chem atmospheric transport model

The GEOS–Chem atmospheric chemistry transport model has been used in a range of previous investigations into atmospheric CO$_2$ and applied in conjunction with inverse analyses to estimate surface carbon fluxes (Nassar et al., 2010, 2011; Suntharalingam et al., 2005; Liu et al., 2016). In this analysis we employ GEOSChem v11–01 at a horizontal resolution of 2° latitude by 2.5° longitude, with 47 levels in the vertical. Model transport fields are provided by GEOS-5 assimilated meteorological data from the NASA Global Modeling and Assimilation Office (GMAO, Rienecker et al., 2008). A detailed information of prior fluxes and uncertainties used in this study is given in Section 2.5.

2.4 Atmospheric CO$_2$ Observations

Atmospheric CO$_2$ observations used for this study are taken from the NOAA–ESRL GLOBALVIEWplus Observation Package v4.2 (Obspack, Cooperative Global Atmospheric Data Integration Project, 2018). CO$_2$ measurement records for the period 2000–2017 from 86 surface sites were used in this analysis. Further details on the measurement sites and the site-specific observation uncertainty characteristics are presented in Table A1 of the Appendix. The specification of observational uncertainty associated with incorporation of the atmospheric CO$_2$ measurements into the LETKF is derived using the methods of Chevallier et al. (2010); we use the standard deviation of measurement variability from detrended and deseasonalized CO$_2$ time series at each measurement site. The resulting specification of observational uncertainty varies between 0.16 ppm (for stations in and around the Southern Ocean) to over 5 ppm (for stations in continental interiors) (see Appendix Table A1 for more details).

2.5 Specification of Prior CO$_2$ Fluxes and Associated Flux Uncertainties

A priori CO$_2$ flux distributions implemented in the GEOS–Chem model for this analysis include fossil fuel emissions taken from Chevallier et al. (2019) (Global Atmospheric Research version 4.3.2, Crippa et al., 2016, scaled globally and annually from Le Quéré et al., 2018), and land biosphere fluxes from the Joint UK Land Environment Simulator (JULES, Clark et al., 2011). We evaluate three separate representations for ocean CO$_2$ fluxes, namely, Takahashi et al. (2009) (hereinafter Ta), Landschützer et al. (2016) (hereinafter La), and Rödenbeck et al. (2013) (hereinafter Ro).

Since the primary focus of our investigation is to estimate North Atlantic Ocean CO$_2$ fluxes, we have evaluated in more detail, the impact of different specifications of prior flux uncertainty for ocean fluxes. Specifications of prior flux uncertainty for ocean fluxes include (a) a percentage-based level (U1:60% of prior flux, and U2:120% of prior flux), and (b) gridded flux uncertainties representing the variation or ‘spread’ of the different ocean flux data products at each location, and based on the standard deviation of the variation among the prior fluxes (U3: spread-based uncertainty; see equation 1). This specification follows previously used methods to characterize uncertainties in ocean flux distributions (e.g., Bopp et al., 2013). For this
latter specification (U3), the gridded prior flux uncertainty, \( U(i,j) \) (for a gridcell with coordinates \((i,j)\)) is specified as the standard deviation of the spread of the different prior flux products. Thus, the uncertainty \( U(i,j) \) is calculated as:

\[
U(i,j) = \sqrt{\sum_{k} (f_k(i,j) - \overline{f(i,j)})^2 / (K - 1)}
\]

Here \( K \) is the total number of the prior ocean flux products considered, and subscript \( k \) refers to an individual flux product. \( f_k(i,j) \) represents the gridded monthly flux for each prior ocean flux and \( \overline{f(i,j)} \) is the gridded monthly mean across all prior ocean flux products. These prior flux uncertainties are estimated on monthly timescales and also account for interannual variations. The representation of ocean prior flux uncertainty is further discussed in section 3.1.

### 3 Results and Discussion

Section 3.1 and Table 1 present sensitivity tests conducted for different prior ocean flux distributions and prior ocean flux uncertainty schemes. Section 3.2 presents the estimates of North Atlantic CO\(_2\) ocean fluxes for the 2000–2017 period. We focus on the long term mean values, interannual variability and trends of the GCL estimates of CO\(_2\) ocean fluxes. In section 3.2 we also compare the results from this study with previous estimates of North Atlantic (NA) fluxes.

#### 3.1 Sensitivity tests on specification of prior flux uncertainty

We first assess the sensitivity of derived flux estimates to the specification of prior flux uncertainty; this analysis is conducted for the year 2003. An initial three year model spin–up, starting from January 1st, 2000 was conducted following the CO\(_2\) simulation and methods of Nassar et al. (2010). We evaluate the sensitivity of posterior ocean flux estimates with three different prior ocean uncertainty schemes U1, U2, and U3, described in section 2.5; these are applied in turn for each of the three prior ocean flux distributions (Ta, La and Ro). Figure 1 presents an example distribution of the spread–based prior ocean flux uncertainty U3 (shown as a quarterly average for an example year of 2003). Figure 1 demonstrates that the spread-based uncertainty scheme (U3) provides a looser constraint on prior fluxes (i.e., levels of prior flux uncertainty > 120%) than the U1 and U2 schemes in the subpolar region, and a tighter constraint in the subtropical region (levels < 60%).
Figure 1. Distribution of the spread-based prior ocean flux uncertainty (U3) (annual average for the year 2003). It is represented here as a percentage of the prior ocean flux for ease of comparison with U1 and U2. The percentage shown for each grid-cell is derived from the ratio of spread–based prior ocean uncertainty divided by the prior ocean flux value at that grid cell. DJF represents the monthly average for December, January, February; MAM for March, April, May; JJA for June, July, August; SON for September, October, November.

Table 1 summarizes the prior and posterior ocean flux estimates for the global and North Atlantic region (sub-divided into subpolar and subtropical regions) from the respective sensitivity tests. The distribution of prior flux for the subtropical North Atlantic shows closer agreement among the three source representations (Ta, La and Ro), with regional variation of 0.05 PgC y\(^{-1}\), in comparison to a regional variation of ~0.1 PgC y\(^{-1}\) for the subpolar region.

Under the constraints provided by the atmospheric CO\(_2\) observations all posterior flux estimates for the North Atlantic show increased uptake (Table 1), indicating that all three representations of ocean prior flux underestimate the regional net atmosphere-ocean flux for the 2003 period. Our estimates indicate a larger increase in CO\(_2\) uptake in the subpolar basin (~0.05 PgC y\(^{-1}\), changing from a prior flux range of -0.13 to -0.23 PgC y\(^{-1}\) to posterior flux range of -0.19 to -0.28 PgC y\(^{-1}\)), in comparison to the smaller magnitude change for the subtropical North Atlantic basin (of ~ 0.02 PgC y\(^{-1}\) from -0.17 to -0.22 PgC y\(^{-1}\)).
Table 1. Global and North Atlantic CO2 flux estimates from the GEOSChem–LETKF(GCL) system for year 2003 (PgC y\(^{-1}\)) summarizing sensitivity analyses on the prior ocean flux distribution. Prior flux references are Ta: Takahashi et al. 2009; La: Landschutzer et al. 2017; Ro: Rodenbeck et al. 2013. Prior flux uncertainty specifications are: U1 60%; U2: 120%; U3: spread–based (following methods of section 2.5).

|                     | Ta       | La       | Ro       |
|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Global Ocean CO2 Flux (PgC y\(^{-1}\)) |          |          |          |
| Ta                  | -1.37    | -1.25    | -2.09    |
| TaU1                | -1.63±0.13 | -1.52±0.13 | -2.31±0.16 |
| TaU2                | -2.05±0.26 | -1.96±0.26 | -2.68±0.31 |
| TaU3                | -2.24±0.28 | -2.21±0.28 | -2.73±0.28 |
| North Atlantic subtropics [15°N-50°N] |          |          |          |
| Ta                  | -0.22    | -0.18    | -0.17    |
| TaU1                | -0.23±0.02 | -0.19±0.02 | -0.18±0.02 |
| TaU2                | -0.25±0.05 | -0.21±0.04 | -0.20±0.04 |
| TaU3                | -0.24±0.05 | -0.20±0.05 | -0.19±0.05 |
| North Atlantic subpolar [50°N-80°N], west of 20°E |          |          |          |
| Ta                  | -0.23    | -0.13    | -0.21    |
| TaU1                | -0.23±0.05 | -0.13±0.02 | -0.22±0.04 |
| TaU2                | -0.25±0.1  | -0.14±0.05 | -0.23±0.09 |
| TaU3                | -0.28±0.11 | -0.19±0.11 | -0.26±0.11 |

We note that the increases in estimated uptake for the North Atlantic basins are relatively smaller (on average in the range 10–20%) than the increased uptake estimated on the global scale (~30–70% changes, see Table 1), indicating that prior flux representations of the North Atlantic are more consistent with the constraints from atmospheric measurements than those for other regions of the global ocean.

Use of the spread–based uncertainty scheme (U3) enables flexibility in specification of the regional magnitude of the prior flux uncertainty, as it allows tighter constraints in regions where alternative prior flux representations are in accord, and looser constraints in regions where prior flux representations differ significantly. For the long term analyses of the remainder of this study we therefore use the U3 flux uncertainty scheme. We will also employ the flux distribution of Landschützer et al. (2016) as the prior flux distribution as it provides interannually varying fluxes over the entire estimation period (2000–2017).

3.2 Multi-year analyses of North Atlantic CO2 fluxes

In this section we present results of a multi-year analysis (for the period 2000–2017) assessing regional estimates of North Atlantic CO2 fluxes on annual to decadal timescales. We assess the GCL a posteriori estimates of ocean fluxes using the prior flux specifications outlined in section 2; i.e., La, Ro and Ta. All other prior flux distributions (for fossil emissions, and land biosphere fluxes) are as described in section 2.4. To evaluate the inverse results in this study further, we compare our results...
with the estimates from three other inverse systems including CAMS (v18r2, Chevallier et al., 2019), CT (CarbonTracker 2019, Jacobson et al., 2020) and CTE (Carbon Tracker Europe, van der Laan–Luijkx et al., 2017). All data are regridded to 2° latitude × 2.5° longitude to be consistent with the GCL model resolution.

Figure 2. Comparison of annual air–sea CO$_2$ fluxes for North Atlantic for the 2000–2017 period for: (a) North Atlantic Subtropics; and (b) North Atlantic Subpolar regions. The GCL posterior flux estimate from this study (red) is derived from the prior flux of Landschützer et al., 2016 (pCO$_2$L: black). The grey shaded area represents the uncertainty estimate on the GCL posterior flux (plotted at a 3 sigma level). Also shown are the flux estimates of (i) Chevallier et al., 2019 (CAMS: yellow); (ii) Jacobson et al., 2020 (CT: CarbonTracker2019: pink); and (iii) van der Laan–Luijkx et al., 2017 (CTE: Carbon Tracker Europe: blue). All time series shown have a 12 month running mean filter applied.

Figure 2 presents the variation of air–sea CO$_2$ flux for the NA subtropical and subpolar regions for the 2000–2017 period (represented as a 12 month running average), and comparison to estimates from previous studies. For the NA subtropical region, the GCL posterior flux magnitude is similar to that of the prior flux, with a difference of less than 0.02 PgC y$^{-1}$ over the period. Variation among the other inverse flux estimates can reach up to 0.5 PgC y$^{-1}$ (e.g., between CTE and CAMS in 2007). These larger variations primarily result from the different prior ocean fluxes used in the respective inverse studies. This
issue has been previously noted by other studies; e.g., Nassar et al. (2011), note that the prior ocean flux used in CTE (Jacobson et al., 2007; van der Laan–Luijkx et al., 2017) provides approximately 85% more carbon uptake (on a global basis) than the ocean flux estimates of Takahashi et al. (2009).

For the NA subpolar region, the GCL posterior flux estimate deviates more from the prior flux estimate (e.g., showing differences of up to 0.09 PgC y\(^{-1}\)), especially in the early decade of the analysis (2000–2010). The majority of flux estimates for the NA subpolar region are in closer accord (Fig. 2b) with differences of less than 0.2 PgC y\(^{-1}\) (the CT estimate is an exception indicating variations of greater than 0.3 PgC y\(^{-1}\) from the other estimates). The long term mean, IAV and trends of these estimates are discussed in the following subsections.

### 3.2.1 Long term mean

Figure 3 provides a comparison of the following GCL flux estimates and associated characteristics for the North Atlantic subtropical and subpolar regions for the period 2000–2017: (i) the long term mean of air–sea CO\(_2\) flux estimates (The underlying data are tabulated in Table 2); (ii) the amplitude of estimated interannual variability (IAV) of fluxes (Table 3); and (iii) the long term trends (Table 4). The IAV is calculated following methods of Rödenbeck et al. (2015) (i.e., derived from the standard deviation of the residuals of a 12 month running mean over the CO\(_2\) flux time series).

Figure 3. Comparison of CO\(_2\) ocean flux metrics for the 2000–2017 period for North Atlantic subtropics (left panels) and subpolar regions (right panels). Metrics shown are the long term mean (panels (a) and (b)); interannual variability (IAV) (panels (c) and (d)); and long term trend (panels (e) and (f)). The GCL estimates (red stars) are shown in comparison to other atmospheric inverse analyses (red symbols),
surface ocean pCO$_2$ products (blue) and global ocean biogeochemistry models (GOBMs, purple). Also shown are the estimated means from each sub-group of analyses (circle symbols) with associated uncertainty (1 standard deviation).

Table 2. Summary metrics of GEOSChem-LETKF North Atlantic (NA) CO$_2$ flux estimates, and comparison with independent estimates (from atmospheric inverse analyses, surface pCO$_2$ mappings, and Global Ocean Biogeochemistry models (GOBMs)) for the period 2000–2017. Listed are estimates for the long term mean. The metrics listed in this table are plotted in Fig. 3.

| Long term mean (PgC y$^{-1}$) | NA Subtropics | NA Subpolar |
|-------------------------------|---------------|-------------|
| **Atmospheric inversions**    |               |             |
| -0.26±0.04                    | -0.25±0.04    | **This study (GCL)** |
| -0.203                        | -0.208        | CAMS (Chevallier et al. 2019) |
| -0.457                        | -0.270        | CTE (van der Laan–Luijkx et al. 2017) |
| -0.307                        | -0.34         | CT (Jacobson et al. 2020) |
| -0.30±0.11                    | -0.26±0.05    | Mean of all atmospheric inverse studies$^b$ |
| **Surface ocean pCO$_2$-based flux products** |               |             |
| -0.263                        | -0.23         | pCO$_2$La (Landschutzer et al. 2016) |
| -0.284                        | -0.252        | pCO$_2$Ro (Rodenbeck et al. 2013) |
| -0.27±0.01                    | -0.24±0.01    | Mean of all pCO$_2$-based representations$^b$ |
| **Global ocean biogeochemistry models** |               |             |
| -0.150                        | -0.197        | NEMO-PlankTOM5 (Buitenhuis et al. 2010) |
| -0.238                        | -0.217        | CCSM-BEC (Doney et al. 2009) |
| -0.342                        | -0.341        | NEMO-PISCES (CNRM) (Séférian et al. 2013) |
| -0.188                        | -0.321        | MPIOM-HAMOCC (Ilyina et al. 2013) |
| -0.351                        | -0.316        | NorESM-OC (Schwinger et al. 2016) |
| -0.205                        | -0.256        | MITgcm-REcoM2 (Hauck et al. 2016) |
| -0.24±0.07                    | -0.27±0.05    | Mean of GOBM studies$^b$ |

We also present in Fig. 3 the equivalent estimates from other independent assessments, including (i) other atmospheric inverse analyses, (ii) surface ocean pCO$_2$–based analyses, and (iii) analyses from global ocean biogeochemistry models (GOBMs, Buitenhuis et al., 2010; Doney et al., 2009; Séférian et al., 2013; Ilyina et al., 2013; Schwinger et al., 2016; Hauck et al., 2016).

For the North Atlantic subtropical region, the long term mean of the GCL posterior flux estimate is -0.26±0.04 PgC y$^{-1}$. This is consistent with the observationally based “best” estimate of Schuster et al. (2013) for the period 1990-2009. Figure 3 (and Table 2) also indicate generally good agreement between the GCL estimate for North Atlantic subtropical region fluxes and
estimates from surface pCO$_2$–based methods and GOBMs. The GCL inverse estimate is also consistent with 2 of the other 3 inverse flux estimates considered, with only the flux estimate from CTE (van der Laan–Luijkx et al., 2017) significantly different with an uptake level greater than 0.4 PgC y$^{-1}$. For the North Atlantic subpolar region, the GCL estimate of the long term mean uptake is -0.25±0.04 PgC y$^{-1}$ (Table 2), which is slightly larger than that of the prior flux (-0.23 PgC y$^{-1}$) and the estimate of -0.21 PgC y$^{-1}$ from Schuster et al. (2013). The ensemble mean from each group (atmospheric inversions, pCO$_2$–based and GOBMs) agree well and range from -0.24 PgC y$^{-1}$ to -0.27 PgC y$^{-1}$.

### 3.2.2 Interannual variability

The standard deviation of IAV derived from the GCL is 0.037±0.006 PgC y$^{-1}$ for the NA subtropics and 0.025±0.009 PgC y$^{-1}$ for the NA subpolar region (Fig. 3, Table 3). The IAV estimates for the NA subtropics from the different analyses display a large range of values (0.019 to 0.059 PgC y$^{-1}$). The standard deviation of IAV derived from the GCL (−0.037 PgC y$^{-1}$) is similar to that of the prior and of the surface ocean pCO$_2$–based estimates but larger than those of the GOBMs (−0.019 PgC y$^{-1}$). The largest IAV estimates (mean value of 0.059±0.024 PgC y$^{-1}$) are associated with the atmospheric inversions, and influenced by the CarbonTracker analyses (e.g., CTE and CT indicate larger IAV magnitudes for this period of ~0.08 PgC y$^{-1}$). Potential causes of the differences between the GCL and CAMS IAV estimates and those of the CarbonTracker estimates are the different prior ocean fluxes employed by the different inverse analyses, and the relative weighting assigned to the influence of atmospheric CO$_2$ observations (Jacobson et al., 2019). The GCL and CAMS estimates use the prior flux of Landschützer et al. (2016) and the CarbonTracker inversions use the prior flux of Jacobson et al. (2007).

The GCL estimate of IAV for the North Atlantic subpolar region (~0.025 PgC y$^{-1}$) is closer in magnitude to the majority of other analyses, which range between 0.015 and 0.036 PgC y$^{-1}$ (the exception being the CT inverse estimate with the largest IAV of 0.114 PgC y$^{-1}$). For this region the IAV estimates from atmospheric inverse analyses display the greatest variation, influenced by the high estimate from the CT analysis.
Table 3. Summary metrics of GEOSChem–LETKF North Atlantic (NA) CO\textsubscript{2} flux estimates, and comparison with independent estimates (from atmospheric inverse analyses, surface pCO\textsubscript{2} mappings, and Global Ocean Biogeochemistry models (GOBMs)) for the period 2000–2017. Listed are estimates for the trend of the regional fluxes over the period. The metrics listed in this table are plotted in Fig. 3.

| Interannual Variability (IAV) (PgC y\textsuperscript{-1}) | NA Subtropics | NA Subpolar |
|----------------------------------------------------------|---------------|------------|
| Atmospheric inversions                                   | 0.037±0.006   | 0.025±0.009 |
| CAMS (Chevallier et al. 2019)                            | 0.032         | 0.023      |
| CTE (van der Laan–Luijkx et al. 2017)                    | 0.082         | 0.033      |
| CT (Jacobson et al. 2020)                                 | 0.084         | 0.114      |
| Mean of all Atmospheric inverse studies\textsuperscript{b} | 0.059±0.024   | 0.049±0.038 |
| Surface ocean pCO\textsubscript{2}–based flux products   | 0.038         | 0.036      |
| pCO\textsubscript{2}La (Landschutzer et al. 2016)        | 0.050         | 0.035      |
| pCO\textsubscript{2}Ro (Rodenbeck et al. 2013)           | 0.044±0.006   | 0.036±0.001 |
| Mean of all pCO\textsubscript{2}–based representations\textsuperscript{b} | 0.018         | 0.018      |
| Global ocean biogeochemistry models                      | 0.014         | 0.015      |
| NEMO–PlankTOM5 (Buitenhuis et al. 2010)                  | 0.027         | 0.024      |
| CCSM-BEC (Doney et al. 2009)                             | 0.016         | 0.019      |
| NEMO-PISCES (CNRM) (Séférian et al. 2013)                | 0.021         | 0.016      |
| MPIOM-HAMOCC (Ilyina et al. 2013)                         | 0.017         | 0.016      |
| NorESM-OC (Schwinger et al. 2016)                         | 0.019±0.004   | 0.018±0.003 |
| Mean of GOBM studies\textsuperscript{b}                 |               |            |

3.2.3 Estimated Trends of North Atlantic CO\textsubscript{2} Fluxes

Our GCL analyses indicate a statistically significant trend of -0.062±0.009 PgC yr\textsuperscript{-1}, i.e., increasing CO\textsubscript{2} uptake in the North Atlantic subtropical basin for the 2000–2017 period (significant at the 95% level with Ordinary Least Squares (OLS, Montgomery et al., 2012) method). This estimated trend is of larger magnitude than those estimated from the GOBMs air-sea fluxes (Fig. 3, Table 4), and of similar magnitude to the trends derived for the surface ocean pCO\textsubscript{2}–based estimates.
In the North Atlantic subpolar region, GCL estimate of the trend in regional CO$_2$ uptake of -0.026±0.015 PgC y$^{-1}$ decade$^{-1}$ is larger than the mean estimate from GOBM analyses, and similar to the majority of other atmospheric inverse analyses (apart from the CT inversion which displays a large estimated trend of -0.1 PgC y$^{-1}$ decade$^{-1}$). However, we also note that our derived estimate of trend for this region is not significant at the 95% confidence level.

**Table 4.** Summary metrics of GEOSChem-LETKF North Atlantic (NA) CO$_2$ flux estimates, and comparison with independent estimates (from atmospheric inverse analyses, surface pCO$_2$ mappings, and Global Ocean Biogeochemistry models (GOBMs)) for the period 2000–2017. Listed are estimates for the trend of the regional fluxes over the period. The metrics listed in this table are plotted in Fig. 3 of the main study.

| Trend (PgC y$^{-1}$ decade$^{-1}$) | NA Subtropics | NA Subpolar |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------------|
| Atmospheric inversions            | -0.062±0.009 (S$^a$) | -0.026±0.015 (This study) |
| CAMS (Chevallier et al. 2019)     | -0.016          | -0.023      |
| CTE (van der Laan–Luijkx et al. 2017) | 0.010          | 0.015      |
| CT (Jacobson et al. 2020)         | -0.067          | -0.102      |
| Mean of all Atmospheric inverse studies$^b$ | -0.034±0.032 | -0.041±0.035 |
| Surface ocean pCO$_2$-based flux products | -0.068 | -0.056 |
| pCO$_2$La (Landschutzer et al. 2016) | -0.070         | -0.029 |
| pCO$_2$Ro (Rodenbeck et al. 2013) | -0.069±0.001 | -0.043±0.013 |
| Mean of all pCO$_2$-based representations$^b$ |                      |
| Global ocean biogeochemistry models | -0.015 | -0.023 |
| NEMO-PlankTOM5 (Buitenhuis et al. 2010) | -0.010         | 0.000      |
| CCSM-BEC (Doney et al. 2009)      | -0.021          | -0.002     |
| NEMO-PISCES (CNRM) (Séférian et al. 2013) | -0.014         | -0.011 |
| MPIOM-HAMOCC (Ilyina et al. 2013) | -0.036          | -0.023     |
| NorESM-OC (Schwinger et al. 2016) | -0.013          | -0.014     |
| MITgcm-REcoM2 (Hauck et al. 2016) | -0.018±0.009    | -0.018±0.009 |
| Mean of GOBM studies$^b$          |                      |

$^a$ The uncertainty of long term mean estimate from the GCL (this study) is calculated as the standard deviation of the annual flux estimates over the (2000–2017) period.

$^b$ The uncertainty of atmospheric-inverse-based mean, pCO$_2$-based mean and GOBM-based mean is calculated as the standard deviation of products for each method.
The uncertainty of the estimated IAV from the GCL (this study) is calculated as the standard deviation of the ensemble posterior fluxes.

The symbol (S) indicates that the calculated trend is statistically significant (at the 95% confidence interval).

The uncertainty of the fitted trend from the GCL estimates is reported as 1 standard deviation of the OLS fitted slope (Montgomery et al. 2012).

### 4 Summary

Our GCL estimates of CO₂ uptake in the North Atlantic for the 2000–2017 period are -0.26±0.04 PgC y⁻¹ for the NA subtropics and -0.25±0.04 PgC y⁻¹ for NA subpolar region. The GCL estimates of interannual variability in air–sea CO₂ fluxes are 0.037±0.006 PgC y⁻¹ (NA subtropics) and 0.025±0.009 PgC y⁻¹ (NA subpolar). Our GCL estimates also indicate a statistically significant trend of increasing CO₂ uptake for the NA subtropics (estimated trend of -0.062±0.009 PgC y⁻¹ decade⁻¹).

Our GCL estimates of long term mean CO₂ uptake for the 2000–2017 period for both NA subtropics and subpolar regions lie between the estimates from other inverse analyses (e.g., Chevallier et al., 2019 (lower) and the CarbonTracker derived analyses of Jacobson et al., 2020 (higher)); primary causes are the different prior flux representations used in the CarbonTracker analyses. Our GCL estimates of long term North Atlantic CO₂ uptake are similar in magnitude to long term ensemble mean estimates from surface–ocean pCO₂ methods and GOBMs (Fig. 3). The magnitude of IAV derived from the GCL is similar to that of the surface ocean pCO₂-based estimates but larger than those of the GOBMs for both NA regions. In this study we have also evaluated a comparison of alternative specifications of the prior flux uncertainty (section 3.2), and present long term flux estimates derived using a spread–based flux uncertainty scheme. This scheme enables representation of the variability among alternative prior ocean CO₂ flux representations and ascribes higher levels of uncertainty to regions with larger discrepancies among prior flux representations; it is therefore preferable to the fixed prior flux uncertainty levels commonly used in inverse analyses. Incorporation of additional prior flux representations of ocean CO₂ (e.g., Roedenbeck et al., 2015) will improve the contribution of this scheme.

Air–sea CO₂ flux estimates and associated metrics derived from our GCL analyses are generally more robust for the NA subtropics than for the NA subpolar region. Limiting factors affecting estimates for the NA subpolar region include higher levels of uncertainty associated with (a) specification of prior fluxes (Fig. 1), and (b) the observational uncertainty at the atmospheric measurement CO₂ sites in these high northern latitudes (Table A1). The number of regional atmospheric CO₂ measurement sites available to constrain NA subpolar fluxes are also relatively few. Improved ocean CO₂ flux estimates for this North Atlantic region will be obtained by provision of additional high accuracy marine boundary layer CO₂ measurements for the region from fixed surface sites and from ships and buoys (Wanninkhof et al., 2019).
Appendix A: The Local Ensemble Transform Kalman Filter (LETKF) system

Here we briefly describe the LETKF system used for estimation of surface CO\textsubscript{2} fluxes. The methodology follows that of Hunt et al. (2007) and Miyoshi et al. (2007), and additional detail is provided in these publications. The LETKF has been previously used in meteorological forecasting, and more recently in atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} data assimilation (e.g., Liu et al. 2019, 2016; Kang et al. 2012). The LETKF provides iterative estimates of the time evolution of the system state, \( x \), (here representing the gridscale surface carbon fluxes, of dimension \( m \)). Each step involves a forecast stage (based on a physical model of the system evolution) and a state estimation stage (the ‘analysis’ step), which combines system observations, \( y \) (of dimension \( n \)), together with the background forecast, \( x^b \), to derive the improved state estimate. The observation operator \( H \) provides the mapping from the state space to the observation space; in this study \( H \) is provided by the GEOSChem atmospheric model. In the analysis step, the surface carbon flux estimates are obtained by minimization of a cost function (Equation S1) which accounts for deviations of the system state \( x \), from the background forecast, \( x^b \), and for the mismatch between observations \( y \) and their modeled representations \( Hx \):

\[
J(x) = (x - x^b)^T B^{-1} (x - x^b) + (y - Hx)^T R^{-1} (y - Hx)
\]

\( A1 \)

\( B \) represents the background flux covariance matrix, and \( R \) represents the observation covariance matrix.

In the LETKF system, an ensemble of model simulations is used to calculate the sample mean and covariance of the system state; thus, the background state \( x^b \) is given by \( (x^b(i); i = 1,2,...k) \) for \( k \) ensemble members. The sample mean \( \bar{x}^b \) and covariance \( P^b \) of the background state vector given by :

\[
\bar{x}^b = k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k} x^b(i)
\]

\( A2 \)

\[
P^b = (k - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (x^b(i) - \bar{x}^b)(x^b(i) - \bar{x}^b)^T
\]

\( A3 \)

\( X^b \) is an \( m \times k \) matrix whose \( i \)th column is \( x^b(i) - \bar{x}^b \). \( P^b \) is the background state covariance matrix (\( m \times m \)).

Similarly the analysis state is represented by the ensemble \( (x^a(i); i = 1,2,...k) \) with its sample mean and covariance given by:

\[
\bar{x}^a = k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k} x^a(i)
\]

\( A4 \)

\[
P^a = (k - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (x^a(i) - \bar{x}^a)(x^a(i) - \bar{x}^a)^T
\]

\( A5 \)

\( X^a \) is the \( m \times k \) matrix whose \( i \)th column is \( x^a(i) - \bar{x}^a \).
The analysis state and covariance $\bar{x}_a$ and $P^a$ are updated based on the background information $\bar{x}_b$ and observations $y$ through the following equations:

\[ \bar{x}^a = \bar{x}^b + P^a H^T R^{-1} (y - H \bar{x}^b) \]  
\[ P^a = (I + P^b H^T R^{-1} H)^{-1} P^b \]  
(A6)
(A7)

The ensemble $y^{b(i)}$ of background observation vectors is defined by:

\[ y^{b(i)} = H(\bar{x}^{b(i)}) \]  
\[ H(\bar{x}^b + X^b w) \approx \bar{y}^b + Y^b w \]  
(A8)
(A9)

where $Y^b$ is the $n \times k$ matrix whose $i$th column is $(y^{b(i)} - \bar{y}^b)$, and $w$ is a Gaussian random vector with mean $\bar{w}^b = 0$ and covariance $\tilde{P}^b = (k - 1)^{-1} I$. Then the analogues of analysis equations (6) and (7) are:

\[ \bar{w}^a = P^a (Y^b)^T R^{-1} (y - \bar{y}^b) \]  
\[ \tilde{P}^a = [(k - 1)I + (Y^b)^T R^{-1} Y^b]^{-1} \]  
(A10)
(A11)

Following Hunt et al. (2007) and Miyoshi et al. (2007) (refer to these publications for the complete LETKF derivation) the overall analysis equation is:

\[ x = \bar{x}^b + X^b [\tilde{P}^a (Y^b)^T R^{-1} (y - \bar{y}^b) + [(k - 1)\tilde{P}^b]^{1/2}] \]  
(A12)

The LETKF allows flexibility in the choice of observations to be assimilated at each grid point, based on the distance ($r$) of the observations from the gridpoint. The localization weighting function $f(r)$ is given by:

\[ f(r) = \exp \left( -\frac{r^2}{2L^2} \right) \]  
(A13)

where $L$ is an observation localization length which can be predefined to determine the outer boundary of the influence of the observations; i.e., the localization weighting function drops to zero at a value of

\[ r = 2. \sqrt{\frac{10}{3}} L \]  
(A14)

The observation localization is realized by multiplying the inverse of the localization function $f(r)$ with the observational error covariance $R$. 

---

16

https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-385

Preprint. Discussion started: 10 November 2020
© Author(s) 2020. CC BY 4.0 License.
Table A1. Atmospheric CO\textsubscript{2} measurement sites\textsuperscript{a}

| Site code | Longitude (degrees) | Latitude (degrees) | Altitude (m) | Site name                                      | U\textsuperscript{b} |
|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| ABP       | -38.16              | -12.76             | 6            | Arembepe, Bahia                               | 1.04                 |
| ALT       | -62.51              | 82.45              | 195          | Alert, Nunavut                                | 1.34                 |
| AMY       | 126.33              | 36.54              | 125          | Anmyeon-do                                    | 8.88                 |
| ASC       | -14.40              | -7.97              | 90           | Ascension Island                              | 0.66                 |
| ASK       | 5.63                | 23.26              | 2715         | Assekrem                                      | 0.80                 |
| AZR       | -27.08              | 38.75              | 24           | Terceira Island, Azores                       | 2.26                 |
| BAL       | 16.67               | 55.50              | 28           | Baltic Sea                                    | 5.50                 |
| BCS       | -110.20             | 23.30              | 14           | Baja California Sur                           | 3.42                 |
| BGU       | 3.23                | 41.97              | 13           | Begur                                         | 3.93                 |
| BHD       | 174.87              | -41.41             | 90           | Baring Head Station                           | 1.12                 |
| BKT       | 100.32              | -0.20              | 875          | Bukit Kototabang                              | 3.49                 |
| BME       | -64.65              | 32.37              | 17           | St. Davids Head, Bermuda                      | 2.57                 |
| BMW       | -64.88              | 32.27              | 60           | Tudor Hill, Bermuda                           | 2.12                 |
| BRW       | -156.60             | 71.32              | 28           | Barrow Atmospheric Baseline Observatory       | 1.88                 |
| BSC       | 28.67               | 44.18              | 5            | Black Sea, Constanta                          | 9.88                 |
| CBA       | -162.72             | 55.20              | 25           | Cold Bay, Alaska                              | 2.41                 |
| CFA       | 147.06              | -19.28             | 5            | Cape Ferguson, Queensland                     | 1.04                 |
| CGO       | 144.68              | -40.68             | 164          | Cape Grim, Tasmania                           | 0.40                 |
| CHR       | -157.15             | 1.70               | 5            | Christmas Island                              | 0.60                 |
| CIB       | -4.93               | 41.81              | 850          | Centro de Investigacion de la Baja Atmosfera (CIBA) | 3.97                 |
| CPT       | 18.49               | -34.35             | 260          | Cape Point                                    | 0.74                 |
| CRI       | 73.83               | 15.08              | 66           | Cape Rama                                     | 3.47                 |
| CRZ       | 51.85               | -46.43             | 202          | Crozet Island                                 | 0.49                 |
| CYA       | 110.52              | -66.28             | 55           | Casey, Antarctica                             | 0.29                 |
| DRP       | -64.91              | -55.00             | 10           | Drake Passage                                 | 0.41                 |
| DSI       | 116.73              | 20.70              | 8            | Dongsha Island                                | 3.46                 |
| EIC       | -109.45             | -27.15             | 55           | Easter Island                                 | 1.80                 |
| ELL       | 0.96                | 42.58              | 2005         | Estany Llong                                  | 2.41                 |
| ESP       | -126.53             | 49.38              | 47           | Estevan Point, British Columbia               | 1.49                 |
| FKL       | 25.67               | 35.34              | 150          | Finokalia, Crete                              | 3.34                 |
| Code | Latitude | Longitude | Altitude | Location | Elevation |
|------|----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| GMI  | 144.66   | 13.39     | 6        | Mariana Islands | 2.22 |
| GPA  | 131.05   | -12.25    | 37       | Gunn Point    | 2.02 |
| HBA  | -26.21   | -75.61    | 35       | Halley Station, Antarctica | 0.16 |
| HPB  | 11.02    | 47.80     | 990      | Hohenpeissenberg | 6.71 |
| HSB  | -124.73  | 41.05     | 8        | Humboldt State University | 5.78 |
| HUN  | 16.65    | 46.95     | 344      | Heeghatsal    | 6.00 |
| ICE  | -20.29   | 63.40     | 127      | Storhofdi, Vestmannaeyjar | 2.03 |
| IZO  | -16.48   | 28.30     | 2378     | Izana, Tenerife, Canary Islands | 1.21 |
| KEY  | -80.20   | 25.67     | 6        | Key Biscayne, Florida | 4.14 |
| KUM  | -154.82  | 19.52     | 8        | Cape Kumukahi, Hawaii | 1.77 |
| KZD  | 75.57    | 44.45     | 412      | Sary Taukum    | 3.19 |
| KZM  | 77.88    | 43.25     | 2524     | Plateau Assy    | 3.00 |
| LJO  | -117.26  | 32.87     | 20       | La Jolla, California | 2.72 |
| LLB  | -112.45  | 54.95     | 546      | Lac La Biche, Alberta | 8.91 |
| LLN  | 120.86   | 23.46     | 2867     | Lulin          | 5.27 |
| LMP  | 12.61    | 35.51     | 50       | Lampedusa      | 2.08 |
| MAA  | 62.87    | -67.62    | 42       | Mawson Station, Antarctica | 0.32 |
| MEX  | -97.31   | 18.98     | 4469     | High Altitude Global Climate Observation Center | 1.33 |
| MHD  | -9.90    | 53.33     | 26       | Mace Head, County Galway | 3.23 |
| MID  | -177.37  | 28.22     | 8        | Sand Island, Midway | 1.39 |
| MKN  | 37.30    | -0.06     | 3649     | Mt. Kenya      | 1.98 |
| MLO  | -155.58  | 19.53     | 3402     | Mauna Loa, Hawaii | 0.63 |
| MQA  | 158.97   | -54.48    | 13       | Macquarie Island | 0.33 |
| NAT  | -35.26   | -5.52     | 20       | Farol De Mae Luiza Lighthouse | 1.44 |
| NMB  | 15.03    | -23.58    | 461      | Gobabeb        | 1.13 |
| NWR  | -105.58  | 40.05     | 3526     | Niwot Ridge, Colorado | 1.88 |
| OBN  | 36.60    | 55.12     | 484      | Obninsk        | 6.49 |
| OTA  | 142.82   | -38.52    | 50       | Otway, Victoria | 17.45 |
| OXK  | 11.81    | 50.03     | 1185     | Ochsenkopf     | 8.18 |
| PAL  | 24.12    | 67.97     | 570      | Pallas-Sammaltunturi, GAW Station | 3.72 |
| PDM  | 0.14     | 42.94     | 2877     | Pic Du Midi     | 2.71 |
| POC  | -145.13  | 14.97     | 20       | Pacific Ocean  | 1.47 |
| PSA  | -64.00   | -64.92    | 15       | Palmer Station, Antarctica | 0.23 |
| Code | Latitude  | Longitude | City | Country |
|------|-----------|-----------|------|---------|
| PTA  | -123.73   | 38.95     | 22   | Point Arena, California |
| RK1  | -177.90   | -29.20    | 12   | Kermadec Island |
| RPB  | -59.43    | 13.17     | 20   | Ragged Point |
| SDZ  | 117.12    | 40.65     | 298  | Shandianzi |
| SEY  | 55.53     | -4.68     | 7    | Mahe Island, Seychelles |
| SGP  | -97.48    | 36.62     | 374  | Southern Great Plains, Oklahoma |
| SHM  | 174.10    | 52.72     | 28   | Shemya Island, Alaska |
| SIS  | -1.26     | 60.09     | 33   | Shetland Islands |
| SMO  | -170.57   | -14.25    | 47   | Tutuila, American Samoa |
| STM  | 2.00      | 66.00     | 7    | Ocean Station M |
| SUM  | -38.42    | 72.60     | 3215 | Summit |
| SYO  | 39.58     | -69.00    | 16   | Syowa Station, Antarctica |
| TAC  | 1.14      | 52.52     | 236  | Tacolneston |
| TAP  | 126.13    | 36.73     | 21   | Tae-ahn Peninsula |
| THD  | -124.15   | 41.05     | 112  | Trinidad Head, California |
| TIK  | 128.89    | 71.60     | 29   | Hydrometeorological Observatory of Tiksi |
| USH  | -68.31    | -54.85    | 32   | Ushuaia |
| UTA  | -113.72   | 39.90     | 1332 | Wendover, Utah |
| UUM  | 111.10    | 44.45     | 1012 | Ulaan Uul |
| WIS  | 34.78     | 30.86     | 482  | Ketura |
| WLG  | 100.92    | 36.27     | 3815 | Mt. Waliguan |
| WPC  | 167.50    | -29.86    | 10   | Western Pacific Cruise |
| ZEP  | 11.89     | 78.91     | 479  | Ny-Alesund, Svalbard |

*a* Source reference: Cooperative Global Atmospheric Data Integration Project, 2018. Version: obspack_co2_1_GLOBALVIEWplus_v4.2_2019-03-19 ([https://doi.org/10.25925/20190319](https://doi.org/10.25925/20190319)).

*b* The specification of observational uncertainty U on atmospheric CO₂ measurements (and represented in matrix R of Equation A1) is calculated as the standard deviation of measurement variability and using the detrended and deseasonalized CO₂ time series at each measurement site (following methods of Chevallier et al. (2010)).

*Data Availability.* Data sources: (i) Atmospheric CO₂ measurements were taken from obspack_co2_1_GLOBALVIEWplus_v4.2_2019-03-19 ([https://doi.org/10.25925/20190319](https://doi.org/10.25925/20190319)); (ii) Prior ocean flux oc_v1.7 from Rödenbeck et al. (2013) taken from [http://www.bge-jena.mpg.de/CarboScope/](http://www.bge-jena.mpg.de/CarboScope/); Prior ocean flux Landschützer et al. (2016) taken from [https://www.nodc.noaa.gov/ocads/oceans/SPCO2_1982_present_ETH_SOM_FFN.html](https://www.nodc.noaa.gov/ocads/oceans/SPCO2_1982_present_ETH_SOM_FFN.html).
from Takahashi et al. (2009) taken from ftp://ftp.as.harvard.edu/gcgrid/geos-chem. (iii) CarbonTracker CT2019 results provided by NOAA ESRL, Boulder, Colorado, USA from the website at http://carbontracker.noaa.gov. CTE flux estimates taken from ftp://ftp.wur.nl/carbontracker/data/fluxes/data_flux1x1_monthly/. The flux estimates from CAMS(v18r2) taken from https://apps.ecmwf.int/datasets/data/cams-ghg-inversions/. (iv) The model CO$_2$ fluxes for JULES (land) and GOBMs (ocean) taken from (Le Quéré et al., 2018).
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