"Our results indicate that the tropical and southern land regions together are a large source of carbon."

Jacobson et al., GBC 2007

NL:  $-2.9 \pm 1.0 \, \text{PgC/yr}$ T&SL:  $1.8 \pm 1.1 \, \text{PgC/yr}$  GLOBAL BIOGEOCHEMICAL CYCLES, VOL. 21, GB1020, doi:10.1029/2006GB002703, 2007



## A joint atmosphere-ocean inversion for surface fluxes of carbon dioxide:

### 2. Regional results

Andrew R. Jacobson, <sup>1,2</sup> Sara E. Mikaloff Fletcher, <sup>1,3</sup> Nicolas Gruber, <sup>3,4</sup> Jorge L. Sarmiento, <sup>1</sup> and Manuel Gloor <sup>1,5</sup>

Received 31 January 2006; revised 4 November 2006; accepted 27 November 2006; published 17 March 2007.

[1] We report here the results from a coupled ocean-atmosphere inversion, in which atmospheric CO2 gradients and transport simulations are combined with observations of ocean interior carbon concentrations and ocean transport simulations to provide a jointly constrained estimate of air-sea and air-land carbon fluxes. While atmospheric data have little impact on regional air-sea flux estimates, the inclusion of ocean data drives a substantial change in terrestrial flux estimates. Our results indicate that the tropical and southern land regions together are a large source of carbon, with a 77% probability that their aggregate source size exceeds 1 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>. This value is of similar magnitude to estimates of fluxes in the tropics due to land-use change alone, making the existence of a large tropical CO<sub>2</sub> fertilization sink unlikely. This terrestrial result is strongly driven by oceanic inversion results that differ from flux estimates based on  $\Delta p CO_2$  climatologies, including a relatively small Southern Ocean sink (south of 44°S) and a relatively large sink in the southern temperate latitudes (44°S-18°S). These conclusions are based on a formal error analysis of the results, which includes uncertainties due to observational error transport and other modeling errors, and biogeochemical assumptions. A suite of sensitivity tests shows that these results are generally robust, but they remain subject to potential sources of unquantified error stemming from the use of large inversion regions and transport biases common to the suite of available transport models.

Citation: Jacobson, A. R., S. E. Mikaloff Fletcher, N. Gruber, J. L. Sarmiento, and M. Gloor (2007), A joint atmosphere-ocean inversion for surface fluxes of carbon dioxide: 2. Regional results, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 21, GB1020, doi:10.1029/2006GB002703.

#### 1. Introduction

[2] This manuscript is concerned with interpretation of flux estimates from a joint ocean-atmosphere inversion introduced in a companion paper [Jacobson et al., 2007]. This joint inversion combines atmospheric and oceanic carbon observations with multiple transport simulations (16 in the atmosphere and 10 in the ocean) to produce estimates of surface fluxes. Results are produced independently for each unique combination of atmospheric and oceanic transport simulation, and the resulting ensemble of 160 permutations thus includes a sample of uncertainty due

Copyright 2007 by the American Geophysical Union, 0886-6236/07/2006GB002703\$12.00

to errors in transport modeling. Details of the construction of this joint inverse, discussion of its limitations, and results on global scales are presented by *Jacobson et al.* [2007].

[3] As described by Jacobson et al. [2007], the joint inversion does not use regularization techniques to decrease flux uncertainties. It thus admits larger uncertainties for underobserved land regions than inversions that use modelbased priors to blend observationally derived fluxes with predictions from terrestrial carbon simulations. In the atmospheric inversion, a sparse observational data set combined with diffusive transport results in regions whose fluxes cannot be effectively distinguished from one another. The present unregularized atmospheric inversion preserves the raw correlations between such flux regions. It is via these correlations that information from the ocean interior is transmitted to terrestrial flux estimates in the joint inversion. Contemporary air-sea fluxes from the present oceanic inversion differ significantly from forward simulations and estimates based on  $\Delta pCO_2$  observations. These differences drive a reinterpretation of terrestrial fluxes in the tropics and Southern Hemisphere, suggesting that these regions may be

GB1020 1 of 15

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences Program, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, USA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Earth System Research Laboratory, NOAA, Boulder, Colorado, USA.
<sup>3</sup>Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, University of California, Los Angeles, California, USA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Institute of Biogeochemistry and Pollutant Dynamics, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Earth and Biosphere Institute and School of Geography, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK.

Stephens et al., Science 2007

NL:  $-1.5 \pm 0.7 \, PgC/yr$ T&SL:  $-0.5 \pm 0.8 \, PgC/yr$ 

- (American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC, 1998),
- 7. M. Murakami, K. Hirose, K. Kawamura, N. Sata, Y. Ohishi, Science 304, 855 (2004).
- 8. A. R. Oganov, S. Ono, Nature 430, 445 (2004).
- 9. D. Helmberger, T. Lay, S. Ni, M. Gumis, Proc. Nat. Acad Sci. U.S.A. 102, 17257 (2005).
- 10. 1. Wookey, 5. Stackhouse, 1. Kendall, I. Brodholt, G. D. Price, Nature 438, 1004 (2005),
- 11. K. Hirose, Rev. Geophys. 44, RG3001 (2006).
- 12. W. L. Mao et al., Science 312, 564 (2006). 13. T. Lay, J. Hernlund, E. J. Garnero, M. S. Thorne,
- Science 314, 1272 (2006). 14. Materials and methods are available as supporting
- material on Science Online.
- 15. J. Santillán, S. Shim, G. Shen, V. Prakapenka, Geophys.
- Res. Lett. 33, L15307 (2006). 16. D. Yamazaki, T. Yoshino, H. Ohfuii, I. Ando, A. Yoneda,
- Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 252, 372 (2006).
- 17. S. Merkel et al., Science 311, 644 (2006) 18. R. A. Lebensohn, C. N. Tomé, Acta Metal, Mater, 41.
- 19. A. R. Oganov, R. Martonák, A. Laio, P. Raiteri, M. Parrinello, Nature 438, 1142 (2005).

- 20. P. Carrez, D. Ferré, P. Cordier, Nature 446, 68
- 21. L. Moresi, M. Gurnis, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 138, 15 (1996).
- 22. A. K. McNamara, P. F. van Keken, S.-I. Karato. L Geophys. Res. 108, 2230 (2003).
- 23. A. K. McNamara, S. Zhong, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 222,
- 24. S. Stackhouse, J. P. Brodholt, J. Wookey, J.-M. Kendall, G. D. Price. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 230, 1 (2005).
- 25. R. Wentzcovitch, T. Tsuchiva, I. Tsuchiva, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 103, 543 (2006).
- 26. M. Moore, E. J. Garnero, T. Lay, Q. Williams, J. Geophys Res. 109, 802319 (2004). 27. E. I. Garnero, V. Maupin, T. Lav. M. I. Fouch, Science
- 306, 259 (2004). 28. J. Wookey, J. M. Kendall, G. Rümpker, Geophys. J. Int.
- 29. S. A. Russell, T. Lay, E. J. Garnero, Nature 396, 255
- 30. S. A. Russell, T. Lay, E. J. Garmero, J. Geophys. Res. 104,
- 31. J. M. Rokosky, T. Lay, E. J. Garnero, Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 248, 411 (2006).
- 32. We thank D. Mainprice for his petrophysics software package, P. Liermann for assistance during the experimen and the two approprious reviewers for their comments. This work was supported by NSF grants EAR-0510383 and EAR-0456356 (T.S.D., H.R.W., and A.K.M.) and the Carnegiei Department of Energy Alliance Center (T.S.D. and H.R.W.). Experiments were performed at HPCAT (Sector 16), Advanced Photon Source (APS), Argonne National Laboratory, Use of the HPCAT facility was supported by Department of Energy (DOE) Basic Energy Sciences (BES), DOE National Nuclear Security Administration, NSF, Department of Defense (DOD) Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command, and the W. M. Keck Foundation. Use of the APS was supported by DOE-BES under contract W-31-109-ENG-38, S.M. and S.S. also acknowledge support from the Miller Institute for Basic Research in Science

#### Supporting Online Material

www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/316/5832/1729/DC1 Materials and Methods

Figs. \$1 to \$10 Tables 51 to 53

31 January 2007; accepted 13 April 2007 10.1126/science.1140609

# **Weak Northern and Strong Tropical Land Carbon Uptake from Vertical** Profiles of Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>

Britton B. Stephens, 1\* Kevin R. Gurney, Pieter P. Tans, Colm Sweeney, Wouter Peters, Lori Bruhwiler, Philippe Ciais, Michel Ramonet, Philippe Bousquet, Takakiyo Nakazawa, 5 Shuji Aoki, 5 Toshinobu Machida, 6 Gen Inoue, 7 Nikolay Vinnichenko, 8† Jon Lloyd, 9 Armin Jordan, 10 Martin Heimann, 10 Olga Shibistova, 11 Ray L. Langenfelds, 12 L. Paul Steele, 12 Roger J. Francey, 12 A. Scott Denning 13

Measurements of midday vertical atmospheric CO2 distributions reveal annual-mean vertical CO2 gradients that are inconsistent with atmospheric models that estimate a large transfer of terrestrial carbon from tropical to northern latitudes. The three models that most closely reproduce the observed annual-mean vertical CO2 gradients estimate weaker northern uptake of -1.5 petagrams of carbon per year (Pg C year-1) and weaker tropical emission of +0.1 Pg C year-1 compared with previous consensus estimates of -2.4 and +1.8 Pg C year-1, respectively. This suggests that northern terrestrial uptake of industrial CO2 emissions plays a smaller role than previously thought and that, after subtracting land-use emissions, tropical ecosystems may currently be

ur ability to diagnose the fate of anthropogenic carbon emissions depends critically on interpreting spatial and temporal gradients of atmospheric CO2 concentrations (1). Studies using global atmospheric transport models to infer surface fluxes from boundary-layer CO2 concentration observations have generally estimated the northern mid-latitudes to be a sink of approximately 2 to 3.5 Pg C year (2-5). Analyses of surface ocean partial pressure of CO2 (2), atmospheric carbon isotope (6), and atmospheric oxygen (7) measurements have further indicated that most of this northern sink must reside on land. Tropical fluxes are not well constrained by the atmospheric observing network, but global mass-balance requirements have led to estimates of strong (1 to 2 Pg C year 1) tropical carbon sources (4, 5). Attribution of the Northern Hemisphere terrestrial carbon sink (8-13) and reconciliation of estimates of land-use carbon emissions and intact forest carbon uptake in the tropics (14-19) have motivated considerable research, but these fluxes remain quantitatively uncertain. The full range of results in a recent inverse model comparison study (5), and in independent studies (3, 20, 21), spans budgets with northern terrestrial uptake of 0.5 to 4 Pg C year-1, and tropical terrestrial emissions of -1 to +4 Pg C year Here, we analyzed observations of the vertical distribution of CO2 in the atmosphere that provide new constraints on the latitudinal distribu-

Previous inverse studies have used boundarylayer data almost exclusively. Flask samples from profiling aircraft have been collected and measured at a number of locations for up to several decades (22-24), but efforts to compile these observations from multiple institutions and to

compare them with predictions of global models have been limited. Figure 1 shows average vertical profiles of atmospheric CO2 derived from flask samples collected from aircraft during midday at 12 global locations (fig. S1), with records extending over periods from 4 to 27 years (table S1 and fig. S2) (25). These seasonal and annualmean profiles reflect the combined influences of surface fluxes and atmospheric mixing. During the summer in the Northern Hemisphere, midday atmospheric CO2 concentrations are generally lower near the surface than in the free troposphere, reflecting the greater impact of terrestrial photosynthesis over industrial emissions at this time. Sampling locations over or immediately downwind of continents show larger gradients than those over or downwind of ocean basins in response to stronger land-based fluxes, and higherlatitude locations show greater CO2 drawdown at high altitude. Conversely, during the winter, respiration and fossil-fuel sources lead to elevated low-altitude atmospheric CO2 concentrations at northern locations. The gradients are comparable in magnitude in both seasons, but the positive

National Center for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, CO 80305, USA. <sup>2</sup>Department of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Boulder, CO 80305, USA, <sup>4</sup>Le Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et l'Environnement, 91191 Gif sur Yvette, France. 5Center for Atmospheric and Oceanic Studies, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578, Japan. 6National Institute for Environmental Studies, Onogawa, Tsukuba 305-8506, Japan. <sup>7</sup>Graduate School of Environmental Studies, Nagova University, Nagova City 464-8601, Japan, <sup>8</sup>Central Aerological Observatory, Dolgoprudny, 141700, Russia. School of Geography, University of Leeds, West Yorkshire, LSZ 9JT, UK. 30 Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, 07701 Jena, Germany. 11 Sukachev Institute of Forest, Krasnovarsk, 660036, Russia. 12 Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO) Marine and Atmospheric Research, Aspendale, Victoria 3195, Australia <sup>13</sup>Department of Atmospheric Science, Colorado State Uni versity, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA.

"To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: stephens@ucar.edu

1732

22 JUNE 2007 VOL 316 SCIENCE www.sciencemag.org