

## ***Interactive comment on “Nutrient cycling in the Baltic Sea – results from a 30-year physical-biogeochemical reanalysis” by Ye Liu et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 28 October 2016

#### General comments

In this manuscript the authors use a numerical model in combination with data assimilation to estimate nutrient fluxes within the Baltic Sea. They show that the data assimilation scheme greatly improves the results in terms of spatiotemporal concentrations fields. Without data assimilation the model have significant bias in both the annual cycle of the surface layers as well as spatial distribution of nutrient levels, but as shown, the assimilation procedure eliminate significantly of these systematic biases in a very impressive way.

I am unfortunately not at all familiar with data assimilation methods. I tried to get a quick grip on what and how it is done by reading the method description in not only this

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



manuscript, but also previous papers by the authors. Unfortunately, my background knowledge is too small to really understand even the basics of how it is done. Therefore, I hope that another reviewer is able to penetrate the technicalities of the method and judge its applicability. I can only see the end result and that the assimilated model results really do resemble the reality at the scales presented. I think given that the end results are useful for a wider community and focus on the discussion is not on the technical aspects, it would be useful if the authors include a brief paragraph describing in words how observations and model are merged in the assimilation procedure.

Liu et al presents a solid reanalysis of 4 dimensional nutrient fields in the Baltic Sea. The nice correspondence with observations indicate that resulting data set is probably the best available data set and should provide useful for many purposes. Further that present interesting spatial budgets on both fine and basin-wide scales. One can, of course, question our knowledge of the certainty of the detailed source/sink calculations, but anyway the results are interesting and could definitely be considered best available.

Given the journal one could have wished for deeper analysis of the results in terms of biogeochemical processes. Because of my limited understanding of the methodology I cannot really advice on how far such analysis could go, but now there is very little analysis on whether the spatial fields of sources and sinks may be due to or how they are connected to various processes.

Although discussion is rather weak, I think the results are interesting enough, both in terms of the apparently excellent data quality the method results in as well as the Baltic Sea specific results on nutrient fluxes that I recommend publication.

In general, by relatively small effort, the manuscript text can be improved and I provide some, hopefully helpful, comments below to most sections.

#### Specific comments

Section 5.1 It is not surprising that the authors find some significant RMSD for e.g.

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

ammonia in the 1970s. There are substantial temporal trends in data quality and consistent high-quality data is generally achieved only after international inter calibration became standard in the first half of the 1990s. I also believe that ammonia is one of the parameters with largest errors in the 1970s, while phosphate and nitrate was more reliable.

I do not understand “stability” of the assimilation, but that is surely due to my ignorance of the methodology.

Section 5.2 The improvement in capturing the seasonal cycle is impressive. When I study figure 4 in Liu et al (2014) referred to in the text, it seems however, that the improvement is not due to the improved halocline only, but really due to the assimilation of chemical variables. In that figure DIN and DIP seem to be worse when only S and T is assimilated. I am not exactly sure how much interpretation on processes that can be done comparing different assimilated runs, but it seems that when assimilating only S and T, the model fails in using the additional nutrients mixed up. However, I agree that a prerequisite for a deep spring bloom is a deep halocline.

Section 5.3 Also here the improvements are impressive and the spatial variations in winter nutrient concentrations are well captured. This really gives credibility to use these results in flux calculations.

Section 5.4 Secchi depth is a complex variable including strong dependence also on coloured organic matter. It is evident that a higher Secchi depth is obtained using the assimilation, but calculating Secchi depth in the Baltic Sea from modeled algae biomass is not really well constrained so one could argue that by recalculating Secchi using somewhat different attenuation from CDOM could also give a fit to observations with the model without assimilation. Since temporal variation is not captured (which may be due to other causes than biomass), there is no way of knowing which calculation is actually the best and thus applicability of Secchi depth for validation is not very promising. Therefore I suggest that you can remove this section and the associated

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

figure.

Section 5.5 I am not really sure what these horizontal fluxes tell us! Section 5.6 Does the assimilation as such affect conservation or constitute a part of the source/sink? Baring in mind my limited understanding of the methodology, I am wondering whether by having an underlying model simulation with error, corrected by the assimilation scheme the total source/sinks may give some erroneous results? However, I guess if you just integrate currents times concentrations, there should not be any problem.

These results are quite interesting, although a bit challenging to understand. Perhaps it would be somewhat easier to explain if Total P (N) and DIP (DIN) were used instead of Org P (N). The totals would then give the net source/sink of the nutrient and the inorganic show the “gross” source/sink due to net turnover.

It would be easier to read if the comparison with Eilola 2012, was postponed to the discussion. Now, I think the main results from this study is unnecessary difficult to follow, because of the frequent comparison with the previous paper.

Section 5.7 To my knowledge, the model used does only include bio available nutrients. This is fine but should be clearly stated to avoid confusion. Especially for nitrogen, there is a significant net flux through the system of refractory N that is not captured here. I further assume that the budgets are made summing inorganic and organic nutrients, but adding a sentence about that makes it easier for the reader to follow. I am confused by the fact that the budgets in figs 10-11 does not add up. A small net could be attributed to changes in water column storage, but looking for example at phosphorus in Gulf of Finland the net is  $8.6+54.7-50.7-6.7 = 12.6 -6.7 = 5.9$  kton/yr. This is far too much to be storage change. I thought that it could be that only a part of the load was used, but looking at Gulf of Riga there is a net loss of 1.4 kton/yr. Is it a consequence of the data assimilation? In that case, how should this residual be interpreted? In any case it should be clarified and shown in figures 10-11.

Discussion

BGD

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



That gross fluxes are different between approaches are not surprising since it will depend on time-resolution as the authors point out. Oscillating flows due to various processes cause a dispersive transport that to some extent is resolved by the 3D model, but it is not given that the net effect is correct if the processes that regulate the dispersive transport such as e.g., mixing and frontal movements are appropriately modeled. Without really detailed observations of currents and concentrations one have to resort the validation of the dispersive transport to the net effect on e.g. salinity in the basin. Thus, in some sense, the estimate of net transport by a full 3D model may not be that different from the assumptions behind those of using the diagnostic Knudsen approach, i.e. a strong correlation between salinity and the constituent of interest. Having said that, the level of detail is of coarse massively different and the possibilities to make temporal and spatial analyses also greater.

Validation currents and circulation patterns are very difficult and I do not demand that, but it could have been nice with a discussion on how confident we can be in the results of nutrient circulation and source/sink spatial variations in light of how the data assimilation improves circulation. A starting point could be the consequences of that a clear majority of the hydrochemical data has been collected at single locations usually quite central in the basins and not along the stretches of strong circulation. A naive issue that I personally wondering about is whether assimilation of point wise observations may induce spurious circulation patterns?

I would argue that the sub-basin boundaries in the model of Gustafsson etc also (2012) is not arbitrary chosen. As far as possible sub-basin boundaries of this model is chosen according to dynamical constraints such as sills or fronts that can be parametrized. A discussion of the implications of the high-resolution sink/source fields for our understanding of major processes would have been quite interesting. What does the spatial distribution of e.g. net sedimentation or denitrification imply? What are the pathways for organic matter? I am not sure how far you can take this given methodological limitations, but it could be nice here with a few things and not only referring to other model

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

simulations.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2016-301, 2016.

**BGD**

---

Interactive  
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

