

DATA DESCRIPTION FOR FILE <Meteor60.csv>

CONTRIBUTORS

Toste Tanhua

Leibniz Institute of Marine Sciences at Kiel University

Marine Biogeochemistry

Duesternbrooker Weg 20

D-24105 Kiel,

Germany

Email: ttanhua@ifm-geomar.de

Douglas W.R. Wallace

Leibniz Institute of Marine Sciences at Kiel University

Marine Biogeochemistry

Duesternbrooker Weg 20

D-24105 Kiel,

Germany

Email: dwallace@ifm-geomar.de

SCOPE

Hydrographical and chemical data made during the German Meteor 60/5 cruise in the mid-latitude North Atlantic in March/April 2004.

DATA DESCRIPTION

The methods, corrections and post-cruise calibration procedures are described below.

TOTAL ALKALINITY

Potentiometric titration [Mintrop et al., 2000].

CRM corrected from 4 separate batches (batch # 58, 60, 63 and 64). The mean difference between measurements and the Certified values was $-1.19 \pm 0.69 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ (95% confidence interval, $n=69$). Alkalinity values have been adjusted to the certified value by addition of this mean offset. Precision of the total alkalinity single measurement was $4.28 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ (95% confidence interval), determined from measurements of duplicate samples.

The total alkalinity is corrected by adding $1.6 \mu\text{mol/kg}$ from the original data based on cross over with contemporary CLIVAR cruises.

The background and procedures of the correction is described in detail by Tanhua and Wallace (2005).

DISSOLVED INORGANIC CARBON (DIC)

Coulometric titration [Johnson et al., 1993].

CRM corrected from 4 separate batches (batch # 58, 60, 63 and 64). Mean offset between our measurements and the Certified Values was $1.02 \pm 0.44 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ (95% confidence interval, $n = 88$). Measured DIC concentrations were therefore adjusted to the manometric Certified calibration scale by subtraction of this mean offset. Precision of the measurements was $1.49 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ (95% confidence interval), as determined from analyses of duplicate samples.

The background and procedures of the correction is described in detail by Tanhua and Wallace [2005].

NUTRIENTS

The nutrient data was compared with crossover stations for contemporary CLIVAR lines (A16, A22 and A20).

M60 Silicate values too low in the high concentration range compared to CLIVAR data, therefore the following corrections were made;

For $\text{Si} < 20 \text{ } \mu\text{mol/kg}$; $\text{Si}(\text{corr}) = \text{Si}$

For $20 < \text{Si} < 30 \text{ } \mu\text{mol/kg}$; $\text{Si}(\text{corr}) = \text{Si} + (\text{Si} - 20) * 0.2$

For $\text{Si} > 30 \text{ } \mu\text{mol/kg}$; $\text{Si}(\text{corr}) = \text{Si} + 2$

M60 nitrate values are low in the high concentration range, therefore the following corrections were made;

$\text{NO}_3 < 10 \text{ } \mu\text{mol/kg}$; $\text{NO}_3(\text{corr}) = \text{NO}_3$

$\text{NO}_3 > 10 \text{ } \mu\text{mol/kg}$; $\text{NO}_3(\text{corr}) = \text{NO}_3 + (\text{NO}_3 - 10) * 0.05$

The PO_4 data from M60/5 was subject to some analytical difficulties and were of noticeably poorer quality than the other parameters.

CFCs

The CFC measurements performed during M60/5 were made on an analytical system similar to that described by Bullister and Weiss and are reported on the SIO98 scale. The analytical precision was determined to be 0.7 and 0.6 % for CFC-12, CFC-11, respectively, as calculated from duplicate samples, typically at two depths per station.

We determined a sampling blank of 0.007, 0.010 and 0.045 pmol/kg for CFC-12, CFC-11 and CCl_4 , respectively, determined as the median value of 18 deep water samples in the eastern basin. The data has been corrected for this sampling blank.

DATA FORMAT

The data are supplied in comma separated format (.csv).

The header records;

Station#, Depth (m), Date (yyyy,mm,dd), Lat ($^{\circ}\text{N}$), Lon ($^{\circ}\text{E}$), Temperature, Salinity, CFC-12 (pmol/kg), CFC-11 (pmol/kg), CCl_4 (pmol/kg), Oxygen ($\mu\text{mol/kg}$), SiO_4 ($\mu\text{mol/kg}$), PO_4 ($\mu\text{mol/kg}$), NO_3 ($\mu\text{mol/kg}$), NO_2 ($\mu\text{mol/kg}$), DIC-calc ($\mu\text{mol/kg}$), Total Alkalinity ($\mu\text{mol/kg}$).

Missing data are denoted with -999.9, the units for the revised data are identical with the original data.

REFERENCES

Bullister, J.L. and Weiss, R.F., 1988. Determination of CCl_3F and CCl_2F_2 in seawater and air. *Deep-Sea Research*, 35(5): 839-853.

Mintrop, L., F.F. Perez, M. Gonzalez-Davila, J.M. Santana-Casiano, and A. Körtzinger (2000), Alkalinity determination by potentiometry: intercalibration using three different methods, *Scienc. Mar.*, 26, 1, 23-37.

Johnson, K., K.D. Willis, D.B. Butler, W.K. Johnson, and C.S. Wong (1993), Coulometric carbon dioxide analysis for marine studies: Maximizing the performance of an automated gas extraction system and coulometric detector, *Mar. Chem.*, 44 (2-4), 167-188.

Tanhua, T., and D.W.R. Wallace (2005), Consistency of TTO-NAS Inorganic Carbon Data with modern measurements, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L14618, doi:10.1029/2005GL032348.