



The potential of using remote sensing data to estimate air–sea CO₂ exchange in the Baltic Sea

Gaëlle Parard^{1,3}, Anna Rutgersson¹, Sindu Raj Parampil¹, and Anastase Alexandre Charantonis²

¹Department of Earth Sciences, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden

²École nationale supérieure d'informatique pour l'industrie et l'entreprise, Évry, France

³AGO-GHER-MARE, University of Liège, Allée du Six Aout, 17, Sart Tilman, Liège 4000, Belgium

Correspondence to: Gaëlle Parard (parard.gaelle@gmail.com)

Received: 5 April 2017 – Discussion started: 2 May 2017

Revised: 13 September 2017 – Accepted: 11 October 2017 – Published: 5 December 2017

Abstract. In this article, we present the first climatological map of air–sea CO₂ flux over the Baltic Sea based on remote sensing data: estimates of $p\text{CO}_2$ derived from satellite imaging using self-organizing map classifications along with class-specific linear regressions (SOMLO methodology) and remotely sensed wind estimates. The estimates have a spatial resolution of 4 km both in latitude and longitude and a monthly temporal resolution from 1998 to 2011. The CO₂ fluxes are estimated using two types of wind products, i.e. reanalysis winds and satellite wind products, the higher-resolution wind product generally leading to higher-amplitude flux estimations.

Furthermore, the CO₂ fluxes were also estimated using two methods: the method of Wanninkhof et al. (2013) and the method of Rutgersson and Smedman (2009). The seasonal variation in fluxes reflects the seasonal variation in $p\text{CO}_2$ unvaryingly over the whole Baltic Sea, with high winter CO₂ emissions and high $p\text{CO}_2$ uptakes. All basins act as a source for the atmosphere, with a higher degree of emission in the southern regions (mean source of $1.6 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ for the South Basin and 0.9 for the Central Basin) than in the northern regions (mean source of $0.1 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) and the coastal areas act as a larger sink (annual uptake of $-4.2 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) than does the open sea ($-4 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$). In its entirety, the Baltic Sea acts as a small source of $1.2 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ on average and this annual uptake has increased from 1998 to 2012.

1 Introduction

From the early 2000 and onwards, there has been a more active attempt to investigate, understand, and quantify the global carbon cycle by the scientific community since the greenhouse gas carbon dioxide (CO₂) plays a key role in controlling Earth's climate. The oceanic uptake of anthropogenic CO₂ helps regulate atmospheric CO₂ through air–sea exchange. Coastal and marginal seas represent nutrient-rich areas with strong biological activity and are influenced by various anthropogenic factors. As the oceans take up a major part of the anthropogenic emissions of CO₂, many oceanic regions are experiencing ongoing acidification. There are still major uncertainties in assessing the oceanic uptake of anthropogenic CO₂: during 2005–2014 it was estimated at 2.6 GtC yr^{-1} , an estimated 26 % of the total anthropogenic CO₂ emissions (Le Quéré et al., 2015). For a long time, the

lack of information on the coastal seas has barely been considered in the oceanic and global carbon budgets. The coastal ocean's role in terms of carbon export and relative productivity is disproportionately large in respect to its total surface area (7 %), when compared with the open ocean (Bourgeois et al., 2016). As the annual amplitude of air–sea $p\text{CO}_2$ difference is significantly larger in coastal regions than open ocean (Rödenbeck et al., 2013), the variability in the exchange is high.

Various methods, both direct and indirect, are used to determine the air–sea flux of CO₂ (FCO₂) (e.g. Smith et al., 1996; McGillis et al., 2001; Krasakopoulou et al., 2009). Both direct and indirect measures of FCO₂ were used in this study (McGillis et al., 2001; Rutgersson and Smedman, 2009; Gutiérrez-Loza and Ocampo-Torres, 2016).

Other studies have calculated FCO₂ across ocean basins using climate databases (Takahashi et al., 2002) or biogeochemical numerical models (Lenton et al., 2013; Arruda et al., 2015). These calculations, however, have failed to provide outputs covering the global coastlines. This is primarily due to the sparseness of the temporal and spatial data sets (such as *p*CO₂ of the surface ocean or wind fields). The wide range of values of in situ coastal FCO₂ entail even wider uncertainties in global estimates of FCO₂, as there is the potential to under- or overestimate FCO₂ when performing a spatio-temporal integration (Wollast, 1991; Takahashi et al., 2009; Ribas-Ribas et al., 2011). A better comprehension of the local processes controlling FCO₂ along each coastal setting of continental margins will therefore lead to a better constrained set of global FCO₂ estimates. Since the year 2000, many different FCO₂ estimates and measurements have been reported for various near-shore, coastal, and inner-shelf environments. The question of which coastal seas can be a source or a sink remained open until recently: in the study of Chen et al. (2013) the coastal seas act as a sink with a mean value of air to sea flux of $-1.09 \pm 2.9 \text{ mol C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. The study shows that most of the shelves absorb CO₂ from the atmosphere, except at the low latitudes where they act as a source ($0.11 \text{ Pg C yr}^{-1}$) compared to high and temperate latitudes ($-0.33 \text{ Pg C yr}^{-1}$). The study shows that the shelves in the Atlantic Ocean, which represent 33 % of the total absorption, have the highest total absorption. This corresponds to a mean air–sea CO₂ flux of $-1.2 \text{ mol C m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. The spread of these values is a result of the heterogeneous and coupled biogeochemical processes in near-shore and coastal systems (Laruelle et al., 2010). It is necessary to increase our comprehension of the ocean carbon cycle and the air–sea exchange of CO₂ along the continental margins (Alin et al., 2012) because of their high social and ecological impact (Vargas et al., 2012).

High biological activity is the major cause of high CO₂ fluxes between the coastal and marginal seas. With this information, coastal seas may contribute disproportionately to the open ocean storage of CO₂ (Thomas et al., 2004) via a mechanism called the continental shelf pump (Tsunogai et al., 1999). In recent years, detailed field studies of CO₂ fluxes have taken place in a few areas, such as the East China Sea, northwest European Shelf, Baltic Sea, and North Sea (Chen and Wang, 1999; Thomas et al., 1999; Thomas and Schneider, 1999; Frankignoulle and Borges, 2001; Borges and Frankignoulle, 2002; Borges et al., 2003). However, only limited information about these CO₂ fluxes is available on a global scale (Liu et al., 2000b, a; Cai et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2003; Omstedt et al., 2009; Norman et al., 2013b).

The Baltic Sea is a semi-enclosed sea in northern Europe (Meier et al., 2014) that has been relatively well studied (e.g. Omstedt et al., 2004; Hjalmarsson et al., 2008; Backer and Leppänen, 2008; Wesslander, 2011) and monitored. It is characterized by an important upwelling variability (Norman et al., 2013a; Myrberg and Andrejev, 2003; Lehmann and

Myrberg, 2008; Sproson and Sahlée, 2014) and by important river runoffs (Bergstrom, 1994), which were estimated at $17241.9 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ in 2015 (Johansson, 2017). Siegel and Gerth (2012) show that in the Baltic Sea decomposition of organic matter and biological production control the biogeochemical processes. The nutrient and carbon distribution in the water column, as well as light availability, is the limiting factor of these processes. In the Baltic Sea, the former factors are affected by physical constraints such as the stratification of the water, the salinity and temperature profiles, and the sea currents.

In recent years, the Baltic Sea has also been paid more attention to as a coastal system affecting both the uptake–release of anthropogenic CO₂ and the natural CO₂ cycle (Thomas and Schneider, 1999; Lansøet et al., 2015). Between 1994 and 2008 direct CO₂ measurements from cargo ships have been recorded, with a monthly resolution.

The net annual air–sea exchange of CO₂ in the central Baltic Sea and the Kattegat varied both regionally and inter-annually. Wesslander et al. (2010) show that the Kattegat was a sink of CO₂, while the eastern Gotland and Bornholm seas were sources. They show that the interannual variability in the annual net flux is mainly controlled by the winter conditions. This is due to the CO₂-enriched water mixes in winter in the central Baltic Sea. A second point is that the central Baltic Sea receives large amounts of organic material from river water inflow; this may give rise to a heterotrophic system, making the central Baltic a net CO₂ source. Conversely, the Kattegat is highly influenced by oceanic conditions.

The balance between mineralization and production and the depth of the mixed layer in the different oceanic zones examined were shown to be the main drivers of their respective sink–source distributions (Wesslander et al., 2010).

The goal of the present study is to develop an air–sea CO₂ flux estimation based on remote sensing products with a monthly time resolution and 4° spatial resolution and to estimate the error of this method of flux estimation in the Baltic Sea. In addition, we will further describe the processes and air–sea fluxes of CO₂ from 1998 to 2011 in the entire Baltic Sea and discuss the advantages and the limits of the method.

In this study, the air–sea CO₂ flux is estimated with the ocean surface *p*CO₂ in the Baltic Sea estimated from products derived from satellite data in Parard et al. (2015, 2016). The outputs of the method have a horizontal resolution of 4 km and cover the period from 1998 to 2011. Previous studies of the net uptake or release of CO₂ in the Baltic Sea have produced a wide range of results, with net exchange varying between -3.6 and $+2.9 \text{ mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in different time periods between 1994 and 2009 (Norman et al., 2013b).

The study is structured in four sections. Section 2 presents the data and method used in this work. Section 3 presents the wind products used to estimate the exchange (based on satellite data and reanalysis data). In Sect. 4, we analyse the wind products' quality, as well as various aspects of the estimated fluxes, and in Sect. 5 we present our conclusions.




Figure 1. Data available for the Baltic Sea for 1998–2011. The dashed red lines indicate the division into the Central Basin (CB), Gulf of Finland (GF), Gulf of Bothnia (GB), and South Basin (SB). The colour bar shows the $p\text{CO}_2$ values (μatm).

2 Data and method

2.1 $p\text{CO}_2$ map

We used self-organizing map classification along with class-specific linear regressions (SOMLO methodology) (Sasse et al., 2013) to reconstruct the sea surface $p\text{CO}_2$ concentrations. The SOMLO methodology combines two statistical approaches: self-organizing maps (SOMs) (Kohonen, 1990) and linear regression.

SOMs are a subfamily of neural network algorithms used to perform multidimensional classification. During its training phase, the SOMLO methodology first uses SOMs to discretize a data set of explanatory parameters into classes and then locally learns a set of linear regression coefficients to infer the $p\text{CO}_2$ for each class. When presented with a new vector of explanatory parameters, it first classifies it on the SOM map, then uses the calculated regression coefficients to estimate the $p\text{CO}_2$.

We divided the Baltic Sea into the four regions from Parard et al. (2016): the Gulf of Bothnia (GB), Gulf of Finland (GF), Central Basin (CB), and South Basin (SB) (Fig. 1).

We then trained the SOMLO methodology on the data belonging to each of these basins, reconstructing each point by combining the results obtained through each training, weighted by the distance from each point to the centre of each region.

The covariance of the explicative variables with the $p\text{CO}_2$ was taken into account when attributing a data vector to a class, by means of a modified distance function. This allows for certain extreme parameter values to be more easily associated with the areas of the SOM in which the $p\text{CO}_2$ is more correlated with these values.

In addition, we chose to perform a principal component analysis (Jolliffe, 2002) of the training data belonging to each class of each SOM. We kept the first four axes of the principal component analysis and taught the regression coefficients using the data projections on these four axes instead of performing a regression on all the parameters.

2.2 Wind products

In this study we used wind products to calculate the transfer velocity, based on a mesoscale reanalysis product. A reanalysis is a combination of measurements and a model in which the available data are assimilated into a high-quality numeric modelling system. The reanalysis used in this paper was provided by the Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute (SMHI) with the High Resolution Limited Area Model (HIRLAM) geometry (22 km horizontal grid spacing and 60 levels in the vertical; the model top is at 10 hPa) (Soci et al., 2011). HIRLAM is downscaled and dynamically adapted to a higher resolution (5 km grid) with a simplified HIRLAM called the Dynamic Adaptation Model (DYNAM). The observations of 10 m winds assimilated into the system are from four databases: the Integrated Surface Database (ISD) Station History maintained by NOAA's National Centers for Environmental Information (NCEI), the Meteorological Archival and Retrieval System (MARS) at ECMWF, the European Climate Assessment & Dataset (ECA&D) used as input for E-OBS version 6.0, and the national climate databases of SMHI and Météo France (MF). The temporal resolution is 6 h. In the following, this product will be referred to as SMHIp. The method requires for the explicative data to stay coherent in terms of resolution, and as such we chose a temporal and spatial resolution of monthly 4×4 km $p\text{CO}_2$ pixels.

In order to estimate the impact of the wind product on the air–sea CO₂ flux, we computed the flux with a remote sensing product on a daily scale. The wind data are reprocessed QuikSCAT (QSCAT) and ASCAT data (Bentamy and Croizé-Fillon, 2013) with a spatial resolution of 25×25 km. The data are available from 2000 to 2011.

2.3 Calculation of CO₂ flux

The flux of CO₂ (FCO₂) from sea to air (positive value) or air to sea (negative value) is often calculated using the difference in the partial pressure of CO₂ between the surface water and the atmosphere ($\Delta p\text{CO}_2$).

Here, the atmospheric $p\text{CO}_2$ was estimated using the method from Rutgersson et al. (2009) and the sea surface $p\text{CO}_2$ concentrations are reconstructed with the SOMLO methodology (Sasse et al., 2013), as performed by Parard et al. (2015, 2016).

In addition, the exchange efficiency was required, which was expressed in terms of a transfer velocity, k . The flux was then calculated according to

$$\text{FCO}_2 = k K_0 \Delta p\text{CO}_2, \quad (1)$$

where K_0 is the salinity- and temperature-dependent solubility constant (Weiss et al., 1982). The gas transfer velocity was computed using the parameterization from Wanninkhof et al. (2009):

$$k = \sqrt{\frac{660}{Sc}} (3 + 0.1U + 0.064U^2 + 0.011U^3), \quad (2)$$

where U is the wind velocity at a reference height of 10 m and Sc is the solubility-dependent Schmidt number. Daily values of k were computed with a 6 h frequency for SMHI; Eq. (2) is valid for all wind speed ranges. This method will be defined as Method 1.

We compare the results with another method to compute the transfer velocity k from Rutgersson and Smedman (2009):

$$k = 0.24 \cdot U^2 + (3022 \cdot w - 20), \quad (3)$$

where w is the water-side convection, which is estimated from the model used in Norman et al. (2013b). This method will be defined as Method 2.

3 Results

3.1 Analysis of the wind products

3.1.1 Validation of the wind product

To validate our wind product, we compare the SMHI product with a product based on remote sensing data on a daily scale. Here called SATp, 10 m wind data are reprocessed QuikSCAT (QSCAT) and ASCAT data (Bentamy and Croizé-Fillon, 2013) with a spatial resolution of 25×25 km. The two products are quite coherent when compared to all the station data used here, though SMHI seems better, having a higher average correlation coefficient, i.e. $R = 0.84$ versus 0.67 for the remote sensing data wind (we chose not to show here). This is to be expected, as SATp has a much coarser spatial resolution (25 km) than SMHI does (5 km). In the

Table 1. RMS (ms^{-1}), bias (ms^{-1}), and correlation coefficients for in situ data from SMHI, the Östergarnsholm wind tower, and satellite products.

Tower	SMHIp		
	Bias	RMS	R
Total	0.67	2.49	0.84
Östergarnsholm	2.42	3.15	0.74
Falsterbo	1.70	2.27	0.86
Helsingborg	−0.88	1.65	0.85
Hanö	3.64	4.07	0.88
Ölands södra udde	0.62	1.70	0.86
Hoburg	−1.05	1.91	0.88
Nidingen A	3.68	4.17	0.85
Vinga	3.33	3.84	0.88
Ölands norra udde	−0.29	1.52	0.87
Visby	−1.88	2.56	0.87
Måseskär	3.82	4.29	0.91
Nordkoster	2.87	3.30	0.88
Harstena	−0.33	1.45	0.86
Landsort	1.73	2.41	0.83
Gotska Sandön	−1.60	2.20	0.91
Svenska Högarna	1.57	2.31	0.8
Örskär	1.07	2.02	0.86
Kuggören	−0.52	1.90	0.79
Brämön	0.29	1.86	0.78
Skagsudde	−0.37	1.78	0.79
Holmogadd	−0.60	1.85	0.82
Holmön	−0.75	2.13	0.78
Bjuröklubb	0.13	2.16	0.75
Luleå Airport	−2.32	3.17	0.68

following we decided to use the SMHI product to compute the transfer velocity.

The wind product SMHIp used here to compute the air–sea CO₂ flux was compared with wind tower data available from 24 stations in the Baltic Sea, including data from the Östergarnsholm measurement site Högström (2008); Rutgersson et al. (2008). Here, a micrometeorological tower, situated at 57.42° N, 18.99° E, has been running since 1995, making high-quality wind speed measurements at five heights. To validate the satellite data, we used measurements made 12 m above mean sea level in the 1995–2002 and 2005–2009 periods. In addition, we validated the winds using synoptic station data from SMHI for 21 sites along the coast of Sweden.

The wind product SMHIp values agree quite well with the station data (Table 1). Most of the synoptic stations are very close to the coast; thus, there might be a bias due to land influence. The correlation coefficient (R) is quite high (0.66–0.91) and the high average correlation coefficient is $R = 0.84$. This is to be expected given that the spatial resolution is quite high for SMHIp (5 km).




Figure 2. Monthly mean wind speed (indicated by the colour bar) and annual variability (indicated by contours).

The root-mean-square differences (RMSDs) are given in Table 1. We increase the resolution of the wind products by means of linear interpolation to compute the air–sea CO₂ flux. This was done to provide coherency between our data sets.

3.1.2 Wind variability over the Baltic Sea

We examine the annual and monthly mean wind speeds and wind variability for the entire Baltic Sea (Fig. 2) for all 12 months during 13 years from 1998 to 2011. Figure 2 shows the wind speed in colours and the annual wind variability in contours on the seasonal timescale. The mean winds are higher in the CB than the GB, i.e. about 7–7.4 m s⁻¹ versus 5–6 m s⁻¹. In terms of variability, the wind can vary by as much as 1.5–2.1 m s⁻¹ in the CB and 1.4–1.9 m s⁻¹ in the GB. On a monthly scale, high mean winds (8–9 m s⁻¹) are seen in the Baltic Sea from November to February (Fig. 2). Of the four regions, the CB experiences the highest winds in the winter months. March and September are transition months with winds generally between 7 and 8 m s⁻¹. May and June are the months when the winds are generally low, 4–5 m s⁻¹. The largest variability in the winds, as represented by the contours (Fig. 2), is observable from September to December. The variability remains strong

from December to February (1.2–2.4 m s⁻¹) in all the basins, while the lowest variability is observed in July (< 0.8 m s⁻¹).

3.2 Air–sea CO₂ flux

3.2.1 Air–sea CO₂ flux estimation and variability

The air–sea CO₂ flux estimations are shown in Fig. 3, fluxes are computed using the SMHIp wind data, and figures represent the time period from 1998 to 2011. Figures 3 and 4 show the seasonal cycle. We observed the same patterns reflecting the surface *p*CO₂ partial pressure (the air–sea difference in partial pressure) as previously seen in Parard et al. (2016). April to August show an uptake and October to February an outgassing. The interannual variability is slightly larger during the spring; this can indicate a large interannual variability in the onset of biological activities. Spatial differences are larger during the biologically active period. For example, in April the northern basins act as a source area, while the southern basins represent an uptake of the atmospheric CO₂. Transfer velocity is largest in the South Basin and during winter following the wind speed pattern. In Fig. 4, the annual mean concentrations are shown. The flux displays high seasonal and spatial variability, ranging from –11 to 27 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹. On average, between 1998 and 2011, the entire Baltic Sea acts as a sink of –1.2 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹

(Fig. 3). The values estimated from the remote sensing products are in agreement with those from other studies, indicating that the Baltic Sea can be a small source on average or a small sink of CO₂. Most previous research results concerning the carbon budget cover shorter periods, indicating a range between -1.16 and $2.9 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (e.g. Wesslander, 2011; Kulinski and Pempkowiak, 2012), though the maximum values reported in these studies are all found in the same one or two years (Algesten et al., 2006). Half of the studies demonstrate that the Baltic Sea or certain basins of it act as sources, while the other studies demonstrate that it acts as a sink for the atmosphere (Norman et al., 2013a). In Chen et al. (2013), the Baltic Sea shows an air–sea CO₂ flux of $-1.95 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, which is also in agreement with the results of our method.

The annual mean values for transfer velocity, $p\text{CO}_2$, and fluxes for these four regions are presented in Fig. 4.

During the entire study period, the four basins act, in general, as a source. The CB acts as a source, except for in four years: 2003, 2004, 2009, and 2010, with a lower value in 2009 ($-0.8 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$). The GF acts as a source of the same order of magnitude as the CB with four years as a sink: 2005, 2007, 2008, and 2009, with a lower value in 2009 ($-0.8 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$). The SB and the GB act as a source in all the years except 2010 with a low sink ($-0.01 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) and 2009 ($-0.4 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$). The interannual variability is of the same order of magnitude for all the basins; however, the largest variability is seen in the GB, acting as a source until 2008 ($> 1.7 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) and a smaller source afterwards ($< 0.8 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$). The seasonal cycle does not show different patterns for the different basins. The seasonal cycle is smaller for the northernmost basin (GB) (Fig. 3).

Between 1998 and 2011, the annual air–sea CO₂ flux in the Baltic Sea is always positive (Fig. 4), but we observed a higher flux before 2003 and after 2007. The four basins display a decrease in the flux from 1998 to 2011 (Fig. 4). The decrease is larger in the GB; after 2008 the value is half of the value before. A smaller decrease is observed in the GF. A decreasing trend can be explained by transfer velocity or $p\text{CO}_2$, but the decreasing pattern in the flux is not really reflected in the annual values of these parameters. The trend can also be explained by changes in the seasonal distribution of parameters. The seasonal cycle shows a shift in time when the first 5 years (1998 to 2002) are compared to the last 5 years (2007 to 2011) in Fig. 5. In all the basins the uptake is larger in April and May. For the later period, the differences are particularly large in the basins most influenced by ice cover (GB and GF). There is also an indication in the GB and GF for a reduced outgassing in early winter. As the data are not entirely homogeneous as is described in Parard et al. (2015) one should not draw conclusions too far from the suggested trend. The differences in the basins could, however, be related to the higher $p\text{CO}_2$ concentrations in the atmosphere due to anthropogenic emissions; the corresponding increase

in CO₂ concentration in the atmosphere during this period is $23.7 \text{ } \mu\text{atm}$. As the trend, to a large extent, is explained by an earlier onset of springtime, uptake differences in temperature and ice cover might be a more likely explanation.

The coastal region is defined by a distance of 0.5° in latitude and longitude from the coast. Farther than 0.5° in latitude and longitude from the closest coast is defined as the open sea. The CO₂ flux computed in the coastal region is lower in winter and higher in summer than it is in the open sea (Fig. 6). The average difference in CO₂ flux is $-0.5 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$, with a variability of between -5.5 and $2.5 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. The higher difference ($-1.6 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) is observed in 2007, with a lower value for the coastal region. The air–sea CO₂ fluxes are lower for the entire year in the coastal region. Annually, there are three periods when we observe a greater difference, i.e. February–March, June–July, and October (Fig. 6). Biological activity is one explanation for the lower air–sea CO₂ in the coastal region in March–April and October compared to the open ocean region. The biological activity is higher along the coast at these times (Schneider, 2011) due to upwelling near the coast (Omstedt et al., 2009; Norman et al., 2013a); this has the effect of reducing the CO₂ emitted to the atmosphere. In the coastal region we observed a change in the sink between the first 5 years between 1998 and 2002 and the last 5 years between 2007 and 2011 (Fig. 7). The lower air–sea CO₂ flux is observed during the last years and the minimum of the air–sea CO₂ flux is in April and May. It correlates with the observations in Fig. 5. The sink increases in April from $-2.9 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ and in May from $-1.8 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. The monthly difference is small compared with that observed on the seasonal scale, though we may be underestimating the effect of the upwelling on the monthly scale. A review of Baltic Sea upwelling (Lehmann and Myrberg, 2008) demonstrates that the typical upwelling lasts from several days to 1 month on a horizontal scale of 10–20 km offshore. It is therefore possible that the effect of the upwelling may be underestimated.

3.2.2 Uncertainty analysis

The method used to compute the $p\text{CO}_2$ has the advantage of computing a monthly map of $p\text{CO}_2$ for the entire Baltic Sea on a monthly scale from 1998 to 2011 from the data set of in situ data present in Fig. 1. As explained in Parard et al. (2016) for the reconstructed $p\text{CO}_2$ values, the correlation coefficient (R) values are good, with the lowest values observed in the SB (0.9) where the RMS is the highest (i.e. $38.5 \text{ } \mu\text{atm}$). The GF has the highest R value (i.e. 0.97) and the GB has the lowest RMS ($19.5 \text{ } \mu\text{atm}$), the latter being the region with the lowest data density. This error has an impact on the air–sea CO₂ flux computation. The impact of the maximum RMS on the flux is $\pm 4 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. It gives a high influence of the air–sea CO₂ flux and our uncertainty of the air $p\text{CO}_2$ increases this uncertainty.




Figure 3. Annual evolution of the (a) transfer velocity based on Wanninkhof et al. (2009). (b) PCO₂ and (c) air–sea CO₂ flux based on the SMHIp wind product for each basin.




Figure 4. Annual evolution of the (a) transfer velocity based on Wanninkhof et al. (2009). (b) PCO₂ and (c) air–sea CO₂ flux based on the SMHIp wind product for each basin. In the legend: GB: Gulf of Bothnia; CB: Central Basin; GF: Gulf of Finland; SB: South Basin; and BS: Baltic Sea.

The difference between the phase before 2003 and the phase after 2007 could be explained by the repartition of the data used to calculate our results. In order to understand if this repartition of the initial data is responsible for the phase difference, we studied the representation of the data along the different years for each neuron of the SOM maps in each basin (Fig. 8). For the three first basins (Fig. 8a, b, c), all the years are present, at least in part, even if some classes

seem to be solely composed of data measured before 2002, in particular in the southern regions (the blue trend colour classes). In the north of the GB there are no data before 2008; thus, the results that we show can be affected by this lack of data. However, the results are coherent with the other basins. The distribution of the data is well spread (Fig. 8e, f, g, h) throughout the classes.




Figure 5. Seasonal cycle of air–sea CO₂ flux for the (a) Gulf of Bothnia, (b) Central Basin, (c) Gulf of Finland, and (d) South Basin. Solid lines represent the average for the full period (1998 to 2011), dotted lines with markers are for the first 5 years (1998–2002), and dashed lines are for the last 5 years (2007 to 2011). In the legend: GB: Gulf of Bothnia; CB: Central Basin; GF: Gulf of Finland; SB: South Basin; and BS: Baltic Sea.




Figure 6. Average (a) of the air–sea CO₂ flux and (b) of the difference between the coastal region and open sea from 1998 to 2011.

Two tests were performed in order to estimate the error on the air–sea CO₂ flux. One with the SATp wind product and one with the air–sea flux estimation method Rutgersson et al. (2009) describes in Eq. (3). These results are presented in Fig. 9. The two air–sea CO₂ flux estimations are computed using the two sets of wind data, the SMHIp and SATp data sets. The CO₂ flux computed using SMHIp wind data is available from 1998 to 2011 and using SATp wind data from 2000 to 2011. We compared the two products from 2000 and 2011 (not shown here). The two flux estimations from

the wind product have the same order of magnitude. Nevertheless, the seasonal cycle from the air–sea CO₂ flux using SATp product is larger, with a lower value in summer and a higher value in winter. We observe the maximum difference in January (when the flux using SMHIp winds is higher) and in September (when the flux using SATp winds is higher). The monthly variability in the flux using SMHIp winds is 8.7–11.4 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ versus 3.4–13.4 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ using SATp winds. High variability in January using the SATp wind product can be explained by the lack of satellite data




Figure 7. Seasonal cycle of air–sea CO₂ flux for the Baltic Sea. The solid line represents the average for the full period (1998–2011). The dotted line with a marker is for the first 5 years (1998–2002) and the dashed line is for the last 5 years (2007 to 2011).




Figure 8. Panels (a), (b), (c), and (d) are the distributions of the years of each data in each class for each basin SOM. Panels (e), (f), (g), and (h) are the percentages of the total number of data present in each class of the different basins' SOM. The size of the circles in the top figures is also representative of the percentage of the total number of data present in each class of the different basins' SOM.

for this month. In addition, there are also interannual variations. In most years, the Baltic Sea acts as a sink. Using the SMHIp winds, the exchange ranges from -2.9 to $0.6 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ with an average of $-1.6 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$; using the SATp winds, the annual uptake is larger, being between -3.9 and $0.3 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ with an average for 2000–2011 of $-2.1 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. The trend is the same for both products, with a decrease in the flux and an increase in the absorption of $p\text{CO}_2$ from the atmosphere. The average

difference between the wind from satellite and the SMHI wind products gives a value of 0.98 m s^{-2} and has an influence of $0.34 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ on the air–sea CO₂ flux. Our method to recompute the $p\text{CO}_2$ gives a root mean square between 19.5 and $38.5 \mu\text{atm}$, which depends on the basin; this has an effect on the air–sea CO₂ flux of $-1.2 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$.

Two methods to compute the air–sea CO₂ flux have been used: one from Wanninkhof et al. (2009) in which the results are described above, the second from Rutgersson




Figure 9. The air–sea CO₂ flux estimate evolution with Method 1 and the SATp product (blue); Method 2 and the SMHlp product (red); and Method 1 and the SMHlp product (yellow). (a) For a year and (b) on average for all the years.

et al. (2009). The second one used the water-side convection from a model (Norman, 2013). The mean difference between the two products is $1.2 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. The higher differences are observed in 1999 ($3.2 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$) and in 2006 ($2.6 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$). The two methods to compute coefficient exchange give a difference on the air–sea CO₂ flux of 0.088. On a seasonal scale the differences of the two methods are higher in spring and summer (April to August) and range between $4 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ in April and $10 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ in June. In winter, the difference is between 0.2 and $2.0 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$.

To conclude, the $p\text{CO}_2$ incertitude gives a high variability in the air–sea CO₂ flux, the wind products influence the value more than the variability, and the difference is quite similar in all the time series. The method influences the variability and it does not influence all the time series in the same way.

3.2.3 Air–sea CO₂ flux climatology

The climatology of the flux displays high seasonal and spatial variability, ranging from -13 to $10 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. On average, from 1998 to 2011, the entire Baltic Sea acted as a source of $1.2 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. The results are different if we use the method from Rutgersson et al. (2009), which resulted in $1.4 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ and a sink of $-1.5 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ if we used the SATp winds (Fig. 10). The values observed are in agreement with those from other studies, indicating that the Baltic Sea can be, on average, a small source or a small sink of CO₂. Most previous research results concerning the carbon budget of the Baltic Sea cover shorter periods, indicating a range between -1.16 and $2.9 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (e.g. Wesslander et al., 2010; Kulinski and Pempkowiak, 2012), though the maximum values reported in these studies are all found in

the same one or two years (Algesten et al., 2006). Half of the studies demonstrate that the Baltic Sea or certain basins of it act as sources, while the other studies demonstrate that the Baltic Sea acts as a sink for the atmosphere (Norman et al., 2013a).

4 Discussion and conclusions

Canadell (2003) explains that it is really challenging to precisely estimate the variation in the $p\text{CO}_2$ in marginal seas. This is due to several aspects but mainly due to temporal and spatial sparsity of measurements. Remote sensing using applicable algorithms could certainly be an important approach, complementing shipboard observations as well as in situ buoy and wind tower measurements. Using our method, we present the first estimated CO₂ flux climatology based on remote sensing for the Baltic Sea. This gives an estimated annual mean air–sea CO₂ flux of $1.2 \pm 0.8 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$ and a seasonal variability of between -13 and $10 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. The interannual variability is 1 order of magnitude lower, being between 0.01 and $3.19 \text{ mmol m}^{-2} \text{ d}^{-1}$. Several studies have estimated the air–sea CO₂ fluxes in the Baltic Sea over the last decade; most of these examine specific regions, but only a few cover the entire Baltic Sea. Kulinski and Pempkowiak (2012) demonstrate that the Baltic Sea was a source of CO₂ for the atmosphere between 2002 and 2008, but they use data from several time periods and sources. Using a biogeochemical model covering the 1960–2009 period, Norman et al. (2013b) suggest that the entire Baltic Sea acts as a net sink of between -0.22 and $-0.17 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, in agreement with our value of $-0.02 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$.




Figure 10. Temporal evolution of the air–sea CO₂ flux between 1998 and 2011 based on SMHIP data.

In the GF, we found the lowest source of CO₂ from the atmosphere ($0.2 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), which ranges between -0.3 and $0.9 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. These lowest values are observed in 2005 and from 2007 to 2009: during this period the GF is actually a sink for the atmosphere. The GB is a sink in 2009 in our study, but this value decreases from 1998 to 2009. This flux has a value of $0.5 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ in 2002, lower than the value of $2.9 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ from Algesten et al. (2006). This estimation is based on a few days of measurements from a few stations in the GB. Our results indicating a small source are in agreement with those of the study demonstrating a larger sink in the Bothnian Sea ($-0.73 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) and a smaller source in Bothnian Bay ($0.14 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) between 1999 and 2009; this finding could explain why the entire GB region acts as a small sink or a small source, on average.

In the CB, Schneider et al. (2014) demonstrate that in four selected years (i.e. 2003, 2004, 2009, and 2010), the surface water acts as a sink for the atmosphere, as found in our study, with the value of the uptake rates ranging between -0.04 and $-0.3 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. The rate explained the enhanced carbon in the sediments (Schneider et al., 2014). Our study of 2005, 2008, and 2009 finds an uptake value between -0.9 and $-1.0 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, slightly higher than that reported in Schneider et al. (2014), who use boat-line data. This could be because of the spatial resolution of our product, which includes the entire CB. Our mean value for the CB indicates

that it is a sink for the atmosphere. This is in contrast to the findings of Wesslander et al. (2010), who demonstrate that, for a slightly different period (i.e. 1994 to 2008), the CB acts as a source of $1.64 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for the atmosphere. As we explain in Parard et al. (2014), the $p\text{CO}_2$ data do not reproduce the spring–summer bloom in the eastern Gotland Sea described in Schneider et al. (2015). The data used for the computation contain the voluntary observing ships (VOSs) ship line, but we calculated a monthly average. Thus, we missed some higher-frequency processes. In their study, Schneider et al. (2015) explain that the spring bloom takes place around 12 February and 21 March (5 weeks); thus, the average must smooth the variability due to the bloom. In order to improve the $p\text{CO}_2$ data set, it is better to use the daily data in order to better reproduce such processes.

To conclude, the first approximation using remote sensing data and in situ $p\text{CO}_2$ data to compute the FCO_2 gives good spatial and temporal resolutions compared with those of measurements from ships or wind towers. Indeed, the satellite data give information on $p\text{CO}_2$ variability and on FCO_2 . The in situ data set of $p\text{CO}_2$ in the Baltic Sea is used to construct an entire map of the Baltic Sea in space and time with SOMLO methodology. SOMLO was used to accommodate the non-linearity of the mechanics driving the $p\text{CO}_2$. It uses artificial neural networks to classify data into situations and then performs a reconstruction by using a multiple linear regression (MLR) in each class. The process involves clas-

sifying the explicative parameters (i.e. sea surface temperature, coloured dissolved organic matter (CDOM), chlorophyll, time, net primary production, and mixed layer depth)

The first estimates of Baltic Sea air–sea exchange based on remote sensing products display reasonably good agreement with previous estimates and indicate a negative trend, with annual uptake changing from 0.6 to $-2.8 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ over the 1998–2007 period. After 2007, the decrease is smaller and the flux remains quite stable at around $-2.8 \text{ mol m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. The air–sea CO₂ flux product depends on the wind product and on the $p\text{CO}_2$ product, but also on the water convection. For winds, the higher-resolution product gives larger flux amplitudes, and for $p\text{CO}_2$, chlorophyll and CDOM are essential inputs.

The air–sea CO₂ flux is sensitive to different parameters (wind product, $p\text{CO}_2$, exchange coefficient). The wind products impact differently in the Baltic Sea and the northern Baltic Sea. In the Gulf of Bothnia, the wind plays affect the inter-annual variation in air–sea CO₂ flux, which is higher than in the other basins. On average, the Central Basin near the South Basin is the region with the highest uptake of CO₂. The coastal region has a slightly higher uptake than the open sea region.

Several parameters would be useful to improve our product as more in situ data constrain our computation more. However, other parameters such as sea surface salinity, which has a strong variability in the Baltic Sea and a higher frequency, should be used in order to better represent the different processes and better estimate the air–sea CO₂ flux.

Data availability. The air–sea flux CO₂ estimation will be available at <https://ecds.se/dataset/remote-sensing-data-to-estimate-pco2-and-air-sea-co2-exchange>.

Competing interests. The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Special issue statement. This article is part of the special issue “Multiple drivers for Earth system changes in the Baltic Sea region”. It is a result of the 1st Baltic Earth Conference, Nida, Lithuania, 13–17 June 2016.

Acknowledgements. We thank Tiit Kutser and Melissa Chierici for their help. We would also like to show our gratitude to Sylvie Thiria for sharing her pearls of wisdom with us during the course of this research. This research was supported by the Swedish National Space Board (grant no. 120/11:3).

Edited by: Benjamin Smith

Reviewed by: two anonymous referees

References

- Algesten, G., Brydsten, L., Jonsson, P., Kortelainen, P., Löfgren, S., Rahm, L., Räike, A., Sobek, S., Tranvik, L., and Wikner, J.: Organic carbon budget for the Gulf of Bothnia, *J. Marine Syst.*, 63, 155–161, 2006.
- Alin, S. R., Feely, R. A., Dickson, A. G., Hernández-Ayón, J. M., Juraneck, L. W., Ohman, M. D., and Goericke, R.: Robust empirical relationships for estimating the carbonate system in the southern California System and application to CalCOFI hydrographic cruise data (2005–2011), *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, C05033, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JC007511>, 2012.
- Arruda, R., Calil, P. H. R., Bianchi, A. A., Doney, S. C., Gruber, N., Lima, I., and Turi, G.: Air-sea CO₂ fluxes and the controls on ocean surface $p\text{CO}_2$ seasonal variability in the coastal and open-ocean southwestern Atlantic Ocean: a modeling study, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 5793–5809, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-5793-2015>, 2015.
- Backer, H. and Leppänen, J.-M. M.: The HELCOM system of a vision, strategic goals and ecological objectives: implementing an ecosystem approach to the management of human activities in the Baltic Sea, *Aquat. Conserv.*, 18, 321–334, 2008.
- Bentamy, A. and Croizé-Fillon, D.: Reprocessing Daily QuikSCAT Surface Wind Fields., Tech. rep., Ifremer, Brest, 2013.
- Bergstrom, S.: River runoff to the Baltic Sea: 1950–1990, *Ambio*, 23, 280–287, 1994.
- Borges, A. V. and Frankignoulle, M.: Distribution and air-water exchange of carbon dioxide in the Scheldt plume off the Belgian coast, *Biogeochemistry*, 59, 41–67, 2002.
- Borges, A. V., Djenidi, S., Lacroix, G., Théate, J., Delille, B., and Frankignoulle, M.: Atmospheric CO₂ flux from mangrove surrounding waters, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL017143>, 2003.
- Bourgeois, T., Orr, J. C., Resplandy, L., Terhaar, J., Ethé, C., Gehlen, M., and Bopp, L.: Coastal-ocean uptake of anthropogenic carbon, *Biogeosciences*, 13, 4167–4185, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-13-4167-2016>, 2016.
- Cai, W.-J., Wang, Z. A., and Wang, Y.: The role of marsh-dominated heterotrophic continental margins in transport of CO₂ between the atmosphere, the land-sea interface and the ocean, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 30, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL017633>, 2003.
- Canadell, J. G.: Global Carbon Project: Science framework and Implementation, edited by: Canadell, J. G., Dickson, R., Hibbard, K., Raupach, M., and Young, O., Earth System Science Partnership (IGBP, IHDP, WCRP, DIVERSITAS) Report No. 1, Global Carbon Project Report No. 1, 69 pp., Canberra, 2003.
- Chen, C.-T. A. and Wang, S.-L.: Carbon, alkalinity and nutrient budgets on the East China Sea continental shelf, *J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans*, 104, 20675–20686, 1999.
- Chen, C.-T. A., Liu, K.-K. K., and Macdonald, R.: Continental margin exchanges, in: *Ocean biogeochemistry*, Springer, 53–97, 2003.
- Chen, C.-T. A., Huang, T.-H., Chen, Y.-C., Bai, Y., He, X., and Kang, Y.: Air–sea exchanges of CO₂ in the world’s coastal seas, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 6509–6544, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-6509-2013>, 2013.
- Frankignoulle, M. and Borges, A. V.: European continental shelf as a significant sink for atmospheric carbon dioxide, *Global Biogeochem. Cy.*, 15, 569–576, 2001.

- Gutiérrez-Loza, L. and Ocampo-Torres, F. J.: Air-sea CO₂ fluxes measured by eddy covariance in a coastal station in Baja California, México, in: IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, vol. 35, p. 012012, IOP Publishing, 2016.
- Hjalmarsson, S., Wesslander, K., Anderson, L. G., Omstedt, A., Perttilä, M., and Mintrop, L.: Distribution, long-term development and mass balance calculation of total alkalinity in the Baltic Sea, *Cont. Shelf Res.*, 28, 593–601, 2008.
- Högström, U.: Momentum fluxes and wind gradients in the marine boundary layer—a multi-platform study, *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 13, 475–502, 2008.
- Johansson, J.: Total and Regional Runoff to the Baltic Sea, Baltic Sea environment fact sheet, available at: <http://www.helcom.fi/baltic-sea-trends/environment-fact-sheets/>, last access: April 2017.
- Jolliffe, I. T.: Principal component analysis, Springer, New York, 2002.
- Kohonen, T.: The self-organizing map, *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 78, 1464–1480, 1990.
- Krasakopoulou, E., Rapsomanikis, S., Papadopoulos, A., and Papanassiou, E.: Partial pressure and air–sea CO₂ flux in the Aegean Sea during February 2006, *Cont. Shelf Res.*, 29, 1477–1488, 2009.
- Kulinski, K. and Pempkowiak, J.: Carbon cycling in the Baltic Sea, vol. 6, Springer, 2012.
- Lansø, A. S., Bendtsen, J., Christensen, J. H., Sørensen, L. L., Chen, H., Meijer, H. A. J., and Geels, C.: Sensitivity of the air–sea CO₂ exchange in the Baltic Sea and Danish inner waters to atmospheric short-term variability, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 2753–2772, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-2753-2015>, 2015.
- Laruelle, G. G., Dürr, H. H., Slomp, C. P., and Borges, A. V.: Evaluation of sinks and sources of CO₂ in the global coastal ocean using a spatially-explicit typology of estuaries and continental shelves, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 37, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL043691>, 2010.
- Lehmann, A. and Myrberg, K.: Upwelling in the Baltic Sea a review, *J. Marine Syst.*, 74, S3–S12, 2008.
- Lenton, A., Tilbrook, B., Law, R. M., Bakker, D., Doney, S. C., Gruber, N., Ishii, M., Hoppema, M., Lovenduski, N. S., Matear, R. J., McNeil, B. I., Metzl, N., Mikaloff Fletcher, S. E., Monteiro, P. M. S., Rödenbeck, C., Sweeney, C., and Takahashi, T.: Sea-air CO₂ fluxes in the Southern Ocean for the period 1990–2009, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 4037–4054, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-4037-2013>, 2013.
- Le Quéré, C., Moriarty, R., Andrew, R. M., Canadell, J. G., Sitch, S., Korsbakken, J. I., Friedlingstein, P., Peters, G. P., Andres, R. J., Boden, T. A., Houghton, R. A., House, J. I., Keeling, R. F., Tans, P., Arneeth, A., Bakker, D. C. E., Barbero, L., Bopp, L., Chang, J., Chevallier, F., Chini, L. P., Ciais, P., Fader, M., Feely, R. A., Gkritzalis, T., Harris, I., Hauck, J., Ilyina, T., Jain, A. K., Kato, E., Kitidis, V., Klein Goldewijk, K., Koven, C., Landschützer, P., Lauvset, S. K., Lefèvre, N., Lenton, A., Lima, I. D., Metzl, N., Millero, F., Munro, D. R., Murata, A., Nabel, J. E. M. S., Nakaoka, S., Nojiri, Y., O’Brien, K., Olsen, A., Ono, T., Pérez, F. F., Pfeil, B., Pierrot, D., Poulter, B., Rehder, G., Rödenbeck, C., Saito, S., Schuster, U., Schwinger, J., Séférian, R., Steinhoff, T., Stocker, B. D., Sutton, A. J., Takahashi, T., Tilbrook, B., van der Laan-Luijkx, I. T., van der Werf, G. R., van Heuven, S., Vandenmark, D., Viovy, N., Wiltshire, A., Zaehle, S., and Zeng, N.: Global Carbon Budget 2015, *Earth Syst. Sci. Data*, 7, 349–396, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-7-349-2015>, 2015.
- Liu, K.-K., Atkinson, L., Chen, C. T. A., Gao, S., Hall, J., Macdonald, R. W., McManus, L. T., and Quinones, R.: Exploring continental margin carbon fluxes on a global scale, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 81, 641–644, 2000a.
- Liu, K. K., Iseki, K., and Chao, S. Y.: Continental margin carbon fluxes, *The changing ocean carbon cycle: a midterm synthesis of the Joint Global Ocean Flux Study*, 5, 187 pp., 2000b.
- McGillis, W. R., Edson, J. B., Ware, J. D., Dacey, J. W., Hare, J. E., Fairall, C. W., and Wanninkhof, R.: Carbon dioxide flux techniques performed during GasEx-98, *Mar. Chem.*, 75, 267–280, 2001.
- Meier, H. E. M., Rutgersson, A., and Reckermann, M.: An Earth System Science Program for the Baltic Sea Region, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 95, 109–110, 2014.
- Myrberg, K. and Andrejev, O.: Main upwelling regions in the Baltic Sea—a statistical analysis based on three-dimensional modelling, *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 8, 97–112, 2003.
- Norman, M.: Air-Sea Fluxes of CO₂: Analysis Methods and Impact on Carbon Budget, 2013.
- Norman, M., Raj Parampil, S., Rutgersson, A., and Sahlée, E.: Influence of coastal upwelling on the air-sea gas exchange of CO₂ in a Baltic Sea Basin, *Tellus B*, 65, 1–16, <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v65i0.21831>, 2013a.
- Norman, M., Rutgersson, A., and Sahlée, E.: Impact of improved air–sea gas transfer velocity on fluxes and water chemistry in a Baltic Sea model, *J. Marine Syst.*, 111, 175–188, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2012.10.013>, 2013b.
- Omstedt, A., Elken, J., Lehmann, A., and Piechura, J.: Knowledge of the Baltic Sea physics gained during the BALTEX and related programmes, *Prog. Oceanogr.*, 63, 1–28, 2004.
- Omstedt, A., Gustafsson, E., and Wesslander, K.: Modelling the uptake and release of carbon dioxide in the Baltic Sea surface water, *Cont. Shelf Res.*, 29, 870–885, 2009.
- Parard, G., Charantonis, A. A., and Rutgersson, A.: Remote sensing algorithm for sea surface CO₂ in the Baltic Sea, *Biogeoscience Discuss.*, 11, 12255–12294, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bgd-11-12255-2014>, 2014.
- Parard, G., Charantonis, A. A., and Rutgersson, A.: Remote sensing the sea surface CO₂ of the Baltic Sea using the SOMLO methodology, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 3369–3384, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-12-3369-2015>, 2015.
- Parard, G., Charantonis, A. A., and Rutgersson, A.: Using satellite data to estimate partial pressure of CO₂ in the Baltic Sea, *J. Geophys. Res.-Biogeo.*, 121, 1002–1015, 2016.
- Parard, G., Rutgersson, A., and Charantonis, A. A.: Remote Sensing data to estimate *p*CO₂ and Air–Sea CO₂ exchange, ECDS, <https://ecds.se/dataset/remote-sensing-data-to-estimate-pco2-and-air-sea-co2-exchange>, last access: November 2017.
- Ribas-Ribas, M., Gómez-Parra, A., and Forja, J. M.: Air–sea CO₂ fluxes in the north-eastern shelf of the Gulf of Cádiz (south-west Iberian Peninsula), *Mar. Chem.*, 123, 56–66, 2011.
- Rödenbeck, C., Keeling, R. F., Bakker, D. C. E., Metzl, N., Olsen, A., Sabine, C., and Heimann, M.: Global surface-ocean *p*CO₂ and sea–air CO₂ flux variability from an observation-driven ocean mixed-layer scheme, *Ocean Sci.*, 9, 193–216, <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-9-193-2013>, 2013.

- Rutgersson, A. and Smedman, A.: Enhanced air sea CO₂ transfer due to water-side convection, *J. Marine Syst.*, 80, 125–134, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2009.11.004>, 2009.
- Rutgersson, A., Norman, M., Schneider, B., Pettersson, H., and Sahlée, E.: The annual cycle of carbon dioxide and parameters influencing the air–sea carbon exchange in the Baltic Proper, *J. Marine Syst.*, 74, 381–394, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2008.02.005>, 2008.
- Rutgersson, A., Norman, M., and Aström, G.: Atmospheric CO₂ variation over the Baltic Sea and the impact on air–sea exchange, *Boreal Environ. Res.*, 14, 238–249, 2009.
- Sasse, T. P., McNeil, B. I., and Abramowitz, G.: A novel method for diagnosing seasonal to inter-annual surface ocean carbon dynamics from bottle data using neural networks, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 4319–4340, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-4319-2013>, 2013.
- Schneider, B.: The CO₂ system of the Baltic Sea: Biogeochemical control and impact of anthropogenic CO₂, in: *Global Change and Baltic Coastal Zones*, Springer, 33–49, 2011.
- Schneider, B., Gülzow, W., Sadkowiak, B., and Rehder, G.: Detecting sinks and sources of CO₂ and CH₄ by ferrybox-based measurements in the Baltic Sea: Three case studies, *J. Marine Syst.*, 140, 13–25, 2014.
- Schneider, B., Buecker, S., Kaitala, S., Maunula, P., and Wasmund, N.: Characteristics of the spring/summer production in the Mecklenburg Bight (Baltic Sea) as revealed by long-term pCO₂ data, *Oceanologia*, 57, 375–385, 2015.
- Siegel, H. and Gerth, M.: Baltic Sea environment fact sheet Sea Surface Temperature in the Baltic Sea in 2011, HELCOM Baltic Sea Environment Fact Sheets, available at: <http://www.helcom.fi/baltic-sea-trends/environment-fact-sheets/> (last access: April 2017), 2012.
- Smith, S. D., Fairall, C. W., Geernaert, G. L., and Hasse, L.: Air–sea fluxes: 25 years of progress, *Bound.-Lay. Meteorol.*, 78, 247–290, 1996.
- Soci, C., Landelius, T., Bazile, E., Undén, P., Mahfouf, J. F., Martin, E., and Besson, F.: EURO4M Project–REPORT, 2011.
- Sproson, D. and Sahlée, E.: Modelling the impact of Baltic Sea upwelling on the atmospheric boundary layer, *Tellus A*, 66, <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusa.v66.24041>, 2014.
- Takahashi, T., Sutherland, S. C., Sweeney, C., Poisson, A., Metzl, N., Tilbrook, B., Bates, N., Wanninkhof, R., Feely, R. A., Sabine, C., Olafsson, J., and Nojiri, Y.: Global sea–air CO₂ flux based on climatological surface ocean pCO₂, and seasonal biological and temperature effects, *Deep Sea Res. Pt. II*, 49, 1601–1622, 2002.
- Takahashi, T., Sutherland, S. C., Wanninkhof, R., Sweeney, C., Feely, R. A., Chipman, D. W., Hales, B., Friederich, G., Chavez, F., Sabine, C., Watson, A., Bakker, D. C. C. E., Schuster, U., Metzl, N., Yoshikawa-Inoue, H., Ishii, M., Midorikawa, T., Nojiri, Y., Körtzinger, A., Steinhoff, T., Hoppema, M., Olafsson, J., Arnarson, T. S., Tilbrook, B., Johannessen, T., Olsen, A. O., Tilbrook, B., Bellerby, R., Wong, C. S., Delille, B., Bates, N. R. R., and De Baar, H. J. W.: Climatological mean and decadal change in surface ocean pCO₂, and net sea–air CO₂ flux over the global oceans, *Deep-Sea Res. Pt. II*, 56, 554–577, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.12.009>, 2009.
- Thomas, H. and Schneider, B.: The seasonal cycle of carbon dioxide in Baltic Sea surface waters, *J. Marine Syst.*, 22, 53–67, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-7963\(99\)00030-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0924-7963(99)00030-5), 1999.
- Thomas, H., Ittekkot, V., Osterroht, C., and Schneider, B.: Preferential recycling of nutrients the ocean’s way to increase new production and to pass nutrient limitation?, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 44, <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1999.44.8.1999>, 1999.
- Thomas, H., Bozec, Y., Elkalay, K., and de Baar, H. J. W.: Enhanced open ocean storage of CO₂ from shelf sea pumping, *Science*, 304, 1005–1008, <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1095491>, 2004.
- Tsunogai, S., Watanabe, S., and Sato, T.: Is there a continental shelf pump for the absorption of atmospheric CO₂?, *Tellus B*, 51, 701–712, 1999.
- Vargas, R., Loescher, H. W., Arredondo, T., Huber-Sannwald, E., Lara-Lara, R., and Yépez, E. A.: Opportunities for advancing carbon cycle science in Mexico: Toward a continental scale understanding, *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 21, 84–93, 2012.
- Wanninkhof, R., Asher, W. E., Ho, D. T., Sweeney, C., and McGillis, W. R.: Advances in quantifying air–sea gas exchange and environmental forcing, *Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci.*, 1, 213–244, <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.marine.010908.163742>, 2009.
- Wanninkhof, R., Park, G.-H., Takahashi, T., Sweeney, C., Feely, R., Nojiri, Y., Gruber, N., Doney, S. C., McKinley, G. A., Lenton, A., Le Quéré, C., Heinze, C., Schwinger, J., Graven, H., and Khatiwala, S.: Global ocean carbon uptake: magnitude, variability and trends, *Biogeosciences*, 10, 1983–2000, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-10-1983-2013>, 2013.
- Weiss, R. F., Jahnke, R. A., and Keeling, C. D.: Seasonal effects of temperature and salinity on the partial pressure of CO₂ in seawater, *Nature*, 300, 511–513, 1982.
- Wesslander, K.: The carbon dioxide system in the Baltic Sea surface waters, PhD thesis, University of Gothenburg, 2011.
- Wesslander, K., Omstedt, A., and Schneider, B.: Inter-annual variation of the air–sea CO₂ balance in the southern Baltic Sea and the Kattegat, *Cont. Shelf Res.*, 30, 1511–1521, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2010.05.014>, 2010.
- Wollast, R.: The coastal organic carbon cycle: fluxes, sources and sinks, *Ocean margin processes in global change*, 365–381, 1991.