



**HAL**  
open science

## Sensitivity of the Global Ocean Carbon Sink to the Ocean Skin in a Climate Model

Hugo Bellenger, Laurent Bopp, Christian Éthé, David Ho, Jean-Philippe Duvel, Simona Flavoni, Lionel Guez, Takahito Kataoka, Xavier Perrot, Laetitia Parc, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Hugo Bellenger, Laurent Bopp, Christian Éthé, David Ho, Jean-Philippe Duvel, et al.. Sensitivity of the Global Ocean Carbon Sink to the Ocean Skin in a Climate Model. *Journal of Geophysical Research. Oceans*, 2023, 128, 10.1029/2022JC019479 . insu-04195499

**HAL Id: insu-04195499**

**<https://insu.hal.science/insu-04195499>**

Submitted on 29 Sep 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 **Sensitivity of the global ocean carbon sink to the ocean skin in a climate model**

2

3

4 Hugo Bellenger<sup>1</sup>, Laurent Bopp<sup>1</sup>, Christian Ethé<sup>2</sup>, David Ho<sup>3</sup>, Jean Philippe Duvel<sup>1</sup>, Simona

5 Flavoni<sup>4</sup>, Lionel Guez<sup>1</sup>, Takahito Kataoka<sup>5</sup>, Xavier Perrot<sup>1</sup>, Laetitia Parc<sup>1</sup>, Michio Watanabe<sup>5</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> LMD/IPSL, ENS, Université PSL, École Polytechnique, Institut Polytechnique de Paris, Sorbonne  
8 Université, CNRS, Paris France

9

10 <sup>2</sup> Institut Pierre Simon Laplace, CNRS, Paris, France

11 <sup>3</sup> Department of Oceanography, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, Honolulu, USA.

12 <sup>4</sup> Littoral ENvironnement et Sociétés, La Rochelle, France

13 <sup>5</sup> Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology, Yokohama, Japan.

14

15 **Key points:**

16 - Considering the ocean skin increases the global ocean CO<sub>2</sub> sink by +0.26 to +0.37 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>

17 (~15% for 2000-2014) in an Earth System Model

18 - Enabling the ocean skin adjustment to feedback on ocean carbon concentrations dampens

19 this increase to +0.13 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup> (~5% for 2000-2014)

20 - This global adjustment depends on the CO<sub>2</sub> flux formulation and ultimately on the model

21 capacity to transfer CO<sub>2</sub> into the ocean interior.

22

23

24 Corresponding author: Hugo Bellenger, [hugo.bellenger@lmd.ipsl.fr](mailto:hugo.bellenger@lmd.ipsl.fr), LMD, ENS, 24 rue

25 Lhomond, 75005 Paris, France.

26

27 **Abstract**

28 The ocean skin is composed of thin interfacial microlayers of temperature and mass of less  
29 than 1 mm where heat and chemical exchanges are controlled by molecular diffusion. It is  
30 characterized by a cooling of  $\sim -0.2\text{K}$  and an increase in salinity of  $\sim 0.1\text{ g/kg}$  (absolute salinity)  
31 relative to the water below. A surface observation-based air-sea  $\text{CO}_2$  flux estimate considering  
32 the variation of the  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration in these microlayers has been shown to lead to an  
33 increase in the global ocean sink of the anthropogenic  $\text{CO}_2$  by  $+0.4\text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$  (15% of the global  
34 sink). This study analyzes this effect in more details using a 15-year (2000-2014) simulation  
35 from an Earth System Model (ESM) that incorporates a physical representation of the ocean  
36 surface layers (diurnal warm layer and rain lenses) and microlayers. Results show that  
37 considering the microlayers increases the simulated global ocean carbon sink by  $+0.26$  to  
38  $+0.37\text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$  depending on assumptions on the chemical equilibrium. This is indeed about  
39 15% of the global sink ( $2.04\text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$ ) simulated by the ESM. However, enabling the ocean skin  
40 adjustment to feedback on ocean carbon concentrations reduces this increase to only  $+0.13$   
41 ( $\pm 0.09$ )  $\text{PgC yr}^{-1}$ . Coupled models underestimate the ocean carbon sink by  $\sim 5\%$  if the ocean skin  
42 effect is not included.

43

44 **Plain Language Summary**

45 The ocean skin is a thin layer of less than a millimeter that is in contact with the atmosphere,  
46 where the heat and chemical exchanges are controlled by molecular diffusion. It typically  
47 corresponds to a temperature at the ocean interface that is cooler by  $-0.2\text{K}$  than the water at  
48 a depth of a millimeter. It also corresponds to a salinity that is slightly higher at the interface.  
49 Taking into account these temperature and salinity changes in this thin layer can change  
50 calculations of the global ocean carbon sink substantially. We use a global Earth System Model

51 including a representation of the ocean skin to study this impact. We found an increase of 15%  
52 in the simulated global ocean carbon sink. This is consistent with past studies. Enabling the  
53 flux to feedback on the ocean carbon concentration significantly reduces its impact. We  
54 conclude by discussing the uncertainties in the global ocean carbon sink associated with the  
55 formulation of the carbon flux and the representation of the ocean skin.

56

## 57 **1. Introduction**

58 The global ocean represents a major sink of anthropogenic carbon emissions, averaging  
59  $2.8 \pm 0.4 \text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$  during the decade 2011–2020 (26 % of total CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, Friedlingstein et  
60 al. 2022). This estimate is obtained by using independent approaches: (i) An ensemble of  
61 global ocean biogeochemical models forced by atmospheric reanalysis and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>  
62 concentration and (ii) an ensemble of observation-based data products using the Surface  
63 Ocean CO<sub>2</sub> Atlas (SOCAT, Bakker et al. 2016). These data are based on interpolations of oceanic  
64 CO<sub>2</sub> fugacity measurements, and then corrected for the preindustrial natural carbon  
65 outgassing (Regnier et al. 2022). These model- and data-based estimates, cumulated in time,  
66 are compared to estimates of changes in ocean carbon inventories based on hydrographic  
67 campaign (Gruber et al. 2019). Both approaches (i) and (ii) have inherent uncertainties due to,  
68 for example, sparse coverage of oceanic CO<sub>2</sub> measurements (e.g. Walker Brown et al. 2015,  
69 Olivier et al. 2022) or the representation of unresolved processes in the numerical models.  
70 However, even a perfect agreement between these complementary approaches would hide  
71 uncertainties due to the consideration of oceanic variables (e.g. temperature, salinity,  
72 dissolved carbon concentrations) at a depth of one to several meters and not at the ocean  
73 interface. In situ CO<sub>2</sub> fugacity (or effective partial pressure) measurements are from ships and  
74 to a lesser extent from moorings, both of which typically measure water characteristics at 1-

75 5 m depth. In models, temperature ( $T$ ), salinity ( $S$ ) and the  $\text{CO}_2$  partial pressure computed from  
76 alkalinity ( $Alk$ ) and dissolved inorganic carbon ( $DIC$ ) are mean values from the model's upper  
77 level that is typically 1-2 m but can be of 10 m in some Earth System Model (ESM)  
78 configurations. Yet, there can be substantial changes in  $T$ ,  $S$ ,  $Alk$  and  $DIC$  within the first tens  
79 of centimeters (e.g. Ho and Schanze 2020).

80 Under the stabilizing effect of solar radiation or rain, a thin stratification of a few tenths  
81 of meters to a few meters can form at the ocean interface. Diurnal warm layers correspond  
82 to a temperature increase near the ocean surface during daylight when the wind is weak and  
83 sky is clear (e.g., Stommel et al. 1969, Soloviev and Lukas 2014). They are particularly frequent  
84 in the tropics but can also be strong and frequent in high latitudes during the summer (Stuart-  
85 Menteth et al 2003, Kawai and Wada 2007, Bellenger and Duvel 2009). On the other hand,  
86 freshening by rain can lead to the formation of stable fresh and often colder lenses (e.g.  
87 Katsaros and Buettner 1969, Reverdin et al. 2012, Moulin et al. 2021) that can correspond to  
88 a decrease down to -9 g/kg and -1.5K (Reverdin et al. 2020). Rain lenses are frequent in the  
89 tropics where the precipitation rate is high and the wind speed is low (e.g. Drushka et al. 2016,  
90 Moulin et al. 2021) but they can also occur at higher latitudes (Ten Doeschate et al. 2019,  
91 Supply et al. 2020). In addition, vertical gradients in temperature and salinity exist in the  
92 viscous boundary microlayer that typically extends within the first millimeter of the ocean and  
93 constitutes the Temperature Boundary Layer (TBL) and the Mass Boundary Layer (MBL), which  
94 are the diffusive microlayers for temperature and salinity respectively (Fig.1). Saunders (1967)  
95 first described the physics of these layers in which the temperature and salinity gradients are  
96 controlled by sensible and latent heat fluxes and infrared radiation at the interface and by  
97 molecular and turbulent diffusion in the ocean. Most of the time, this leads to a cool skin of  
98 around -0.2K to -0.3K (Fairall et al. 1996) and to an increase in salinity of about 0.1 g/kg (Zhang

99 and Cai 2007, Yu 2010, Zhang and Zhang 2012), but the ocean skin can lead to cooler and  
100 fresher microlayers under rain conditions (Schlüssel et al 1997, Soloviev and Lukas 2014).

101 It has been suggested that thermohaline stratification in the first meters of the ocean  
102 impacts CO<sub>2</sub> exchange at the ocean interface. Diurnal warming tends to increase ocean  
103 outgassing (Ward et al. 2004). On the contrary, rain has been shown to have multiple effects  
104 such as increasing the gas transfer velocity either in or out of the ocean by enhancing near-  
105 surface turbulence and bubbles (Ho et al. 1997), increasing the carbon sink through dilution  
106 in the first meter of the ocean (Turk et al. 2010, Ho and Schanze 2020). Note that freshening  
107 by sea-ice melt and river runoff in coastal regions can also impact near surface stratification  
108 and thus CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes by lowering the water-side CO<sub>2</sub> concentration (e.g., Miller et al. 2019,  
109 Dong et al. 2021), but these processes will not be examined in this study.

110 Air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> exchange occurs in the ubiquitous microlayer described above (e.g., Liss and  
111 Slater 1974), and the temperature change across it has been suggested to be important.  
112 Robertson and Watson (1992) first suggested that the cool skin increases the global ocean  
113 carbon sink by +0.6 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup> (positive flux downward) at atmospheric pCO<sub>2</sub> of 350 µatm. This  
114 estimate was then revised to +0.4 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup> by taking into account sub-monthly wind variability  
115 (Van Scoy et al. 1995). Woods et al. (2014) showed that this estimate is dependent on the  
116 simplified formula used to diagnose the temperature difference across the microlayer and  
117 suggested that the previous estimates are overestimated. There has been some debate about  
118 whether one should consider the gross cool skin effect in the computation of the CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes  
119 as is the case in the above-cited studies. Indeed, as discussed in Bolin (1960), diffusion across  
120 the ocean Mass Boundary Layer (MBL) is the process that limits the rate at which CO<sub>2</sub> is  
121 exchanged between the atmosphere and the ocean. Due to the higher water molecular  
122 diffusion rate for heat than for mass (e.g. Saunders 1967), the MBL is only a fraction of the

123 TBL. From this, McGillis and Wanninkhof (2006) argued that the cool skin adjustment on CO<sub>2</sub>  
124 flux depends on the temperature difference across the MBL. Because this difference is a  
125 fraction of the total cool skin, they predict a weak CO<sub>2</sub> flux adjustment assuming a linear  
126 temperature profile in the TBL. Based on these considerations, Zhang and Cai (2007)  
127 estimated that the cool skin effect on CO<sub>2</sub> flux is about +0.05 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup> and largely compensated  
128 by the increase in salinity in the MBL. However, they only consider the change in solubility  
129 associated with changes in temperature and salinity and not on the interfacial CO<sub>2</sub>  
130 concentration (see the discussion in Woolf et al. 2016). Using a uniform -0.14K temperature  
131 and a +0.1 g/kg salinity difference between the sub-skin and the interface, Woolf et al. (2016)  
132 estimate an increase of global ocean sink to be roughly +0.34 Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup>. Using SOCAT-based  
133 product, and taking constant temperature and salinity differences in the ocean skin of -0.17K  
134 and 0.1 g/kg, Watson et al. (2020) found a mean increase of ocean sink of +0.4 Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup> for  
135 1992-2018. Using monthly mean surface meteorology from ERA5 to compute the cool skin  
136 effect from Fairall et al. (1996), Dong et al. (2022) also found a comparable increase due to  
137 the cool skin effect of about 0.39 Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup> for 1982-2020 without taking into account the  
138 competing MBL salinity gradient effect.

139 Note that, according to Watson et al. (2020), another correction has to be made to the  
140 SOCAT data because the measured CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations correspond to a depth of 1 meter or  
141 more. They used satellite sub-skin temperature estimates (Banzon et al. 2016) to determine  
142 the waterside CO<sub>2</sub> concentration and found an additional increase in the flux of +0.4 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>  
143 for 1992-2018. Note that the Watson et al. (2020) estimate in the latest global carbon budget  
144 (Friedlingstein et al. 2022) used a new version of the SST satellite product (OISSTv2.1,  
145 Merchant et al. 2019) that corrected a cool bias present in the former version of this SST  
146 product (OISSTv2.0), but it remains an outlier among the other estimates. Using buoy SST as

147 reference, Dong et al. (2022) found a warm bias in SOCAT SST which impact is  $+0.19 \text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$   
148 on the average for 1982-2020. Acknowledging the remaining substantial uncertainty around  
149 the river flux adjustment, the  $\text{CO}_2$  sink increases due to the taking into account of the cool skin  
150 and warm bias correction appears to be able to reconcile the SOCAT-based estimates with the  
151 independent Gruber et al. (2019) 1994-2007 ocean sink estimate (Watson et al. 2020, Dong  
152 et al. 2022).

153 Previous evaluations of the impact of the diffusive microlayer on carbon exchanges were  
154 off-line diagnostics based on observations with limitations in terms of spatiotemporal  
155 coverage (Robertson and Watson 1992, Van Scoy et al. 1995, Zhang and Cai 2007, Woods et  
156 al. 2014, Woolf et al. 2016, Ashton 2016, Watson et al. 2020, Shutler et al. 2020, Dong et al.  
157 2022). Furthermore, some of the studies used monthly-averaged of surface winds or idealized  
158 wind distributions to compute the  $\text{CO}_2$  transfer velocity and most assumed constant and  
159 homogeneous temperature and salinity differences across the diffusive layers. To overcome  
160 the issue of diverse and limited data in time and space to compute global air-sea  $\text{CO}_2$  fluxes,  
161 we use the coherent, although imperfect, set of variables from a coupled climate model (IPSL-  
162 CM6, Boucher et al. 2020). Further, to assess the necessity of taking into account the near-  
163 surface vertical gradients in ocean temperature and salinity, the Bellenger et al. (2017)  
164 parameterization that represents the near ocean surface temperature and salinity profiles (in  
165 the microlayer and below) that are not resolved by the ocean model is included in IPSL-CM6.  
166 Air-sea  $\text{CO}_2$  fluxes are then diagnosed using a range of expressions from past literature to  
167 illustrate the necessity of a physically based and interactive diagnostic of the ocean surface  
168 layers in computing these fluxes.

169           The next section presents the design of the sensitivity experiments and the analysis  
170 tool used in this study, section 3 contains the main results, and Section 4 discusses the  
171 uncertainties.

172

## 173       **2. Approach and Methods**

174

### 175       2.1 Earth System Model

176       The Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace Coupled Model Version 6.1, Low Resolution (IPSL-CM6A-  
177 LR) was used in this study, and details of the model and its evaluation can be found in Boucher  
178 et al. (2020). IPSL-CM6A-LR will be referred to as IPSL-CM6 in the following. Here, we only  
179 describe the model components and parameterizations that are important for our study. The  
180 atmospheric (LMDZ, Hourdin et al. 2019) and oceanic (NEMO, Madec et al., 2017) components  
181 exchange energy, water and carbon and are coupled every 90 minutes. The atmospheric  
182 model configuration has a horizontal resolution of  $2.5^{\circ} \times 1.5^{\circ}$  and the ocean resolution is  $1^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}$ .  
183 The ocean model configuration has a non-uniform vertical resolution that increases from 1 m  
184 at the surface to 10 m at 100 m depth and 200 m at the bottom. The ocean model includes  
185 the biogeochemical model NEMO-PISCES (Aumont et al. 2015), representing, in particular, the  
186 ocean carbon cycle and including both its inorganic and organic parts and their respective  
187 influences on the seawater concentrations of dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) and alkalinity  
188 (Alk). The model salinity is absolute salinity in g/kg and so are the results presented here.

189

### 190       2.2 The ocean skin parameterization

191

192 Figure 1a schematically represents the vertical temperature and salinity profiles that occur  
193 within the ocean model first layer and that are parameterized following Bellenger et al. (2017)  
194 that is available online (see data availability section). Figure 1a also provides the notations for  
195 the different depths that will be considered in this study, namely at the interface (*int* subscript)  
196 at the base of the MBL and TBL (*MBL* and *TBL* subscripts), and at the middle of the ocean  
197 model first level ( $h/2$  subscript, with  $h$  the depth of the ocean model first level).

198 The ocean skin parameterization from Bellenger et al. (2017) used here is based on  
199 Saunders (1967). It computes differences in temperature and salinity between the interface  
200 and the bases of the TBL and MBL (Fig. 1a). The parameterization assumes that the TBL and  
201 MBL depth are proportional to each other and proportional to the kinematic viscosity divided  
202 by the water-side friction velocity. This friction velocity is a function of surface fluxes of heat,  
203 radiation and momentum. The dependence of the Saunders proportional parameter on the  
204 turbulence regime is taken into account following Fairall et al. (1996). In addition, the  
205 stabilizing (freshening) and increased turbulence due to rain are also taken into account as  
206 detailed in Schlüssel et al. (1997). From this, the differences in temperature and salinity across  
207 the TBL and MBL ( $T_{int} - T_{TBL}$  and  $S_{int} - S_{MBL}$ ) and the TBL and MBL depths ( $z_{TBL}$  and  $z_{MBL}$ )  
208 are computed at each time step (see implementation details below). Note that because  
209 thermal diffusivity is larger than the diffusivity of salt,  $z_{TBL}$  is larger than  $z_{MBL}$ . The temperature  
210 at the base of the MBL is deduced assuming a linear temperature profile within the TBL from  
211  $z_{MBL}$  and  $z_{TBL}$ .

212 The Bellenger et al. (2017) parameterization further diagnoses the differences in  
213 temperature and salinity between the base of the TBL/MBL and the ocean model first level at  
214  $h/2$  depth (Fig. 1a). This part of the parameterization is an extension of Zeng and Beljaars  
215 (2005) that was originally limited to represent temperature increase with diurnal warming.

216 Bellenger et al. (2017) extended it to salinity variations to allow negative temperature  
 217 anomalies associated with rain. The one-dimensional heat and salinity budgets are integrated  
 218 between a given depth  $d$  and the base of the microlayer assuming a temperature profile of  
 219 the form:

$$220 \quad T_{TBL} - T(z) = \left[ \frac{(z+z_{TBL})}{-d+z_{TBL}} \right]^\nu (T_{TBL} - T_d) \quad (1)$$

221 With  $z$  being the depth (negative),  $T_d$  is the mixed layer temperature corresponding to a  $d =$   
 222 3m depth, and  $\nu$  is a shape parameter equal to 0.3 in Zeng and Beljaars (2005). A similar  
 223 profile is used for salinity. This provides a time evolution of temperature and salinity  
 224 difference below the microlayer depending on surface fluxes (heat and radiative fluxes,  
 225 momentum flux and rainfall) and vertical mixing that is parameterized in the framework of  
 226 the Monin-Obukhov similarity theory (Large et al. 1994) and is a function of the same surface  
 227 fluxes. Note that changes in salinity and temperature due to sea-ice melt are not included in  
 228 the Bellenger et al. (2017) parameterization.

229 Inputs of the Bellenger et al. (2017) ocean skin parameterization are therefore surface  
 230 fluxes (heat, radiation, rain and momentum) that are computed by the atmospheric  
 231 component of IPSL-CM6 at each physical time-step. Therefore, the ocean skin  
 232 parameterization is implemented in the atmospheric component and  $T_{Int} - T_{TBL}$  and  $S_{Int} -$   
 233  $S_{MBL}$  and  $T_{TBL} - T_{h/2}$  and  $S_{MBL} - S_{h/2}$  are computed online at each atmospheric physical  
 234 time-step (15 minutes). Note that the interface temperature is used to compute the turbulent  
 235 heat fluxes and the upward longwave radiation from the ocean surface of the next timestep.

236 To validate the ocean surface temperature and salinity gradients produced by IPSL-CM6  
 237 with the Bellenger et al. (2017) parameterization, we compared the distributions of 90  
 238 minutes outputs of our model with outputs of the Bellenger et al. (2017) parameterization  
 239 forced by hourly ERA5 fluxes (Hersbach et al., 2020). The results are presented in Section 3.1.

240

### 241 2.3 Air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> flux formulations

242 The air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> flux ( $F$ , in mol m<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>, positive downward) can be written as (McGillis and  
243 Wanninkhof 2006):

$$\begin{aligned} 244 \quad F &= k_w \sqrt{660/Sc(T)} [ [CO_{2aq}]_i(T, S) - [CO_{2aq}]_w(T, S, DIC, Alk) ] \\ 245 \quad &= k_w \sqrt{660/Sc(T)} [ K_0(T, S) pCO_2^{atm}(T, S) - [CO_{2aq}]_w(T, S, DIC, Alk) ] \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

246 Where  $k_w$  is the gas transfer velocity (in m s<sup>-1</sup>) depending on the surface wind following Ho  
247 et al. (2006) and Wanninkhof (2014),  $Sc$  is the Schmidt number,  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  and  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  are the  
248 interfacial and waterside aqueous CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations (in mol m<sup>-3</sup>). The interfacial CO<sub>2</sub>  
249 concentration can be written as the product of  $K_0$ , the CO<sub>2</sub> aqueous-phase solubility  
250 coefficient (a function of temperature and salinity in mol m<sup>-3</sup> atm<sup>-1</sup>, Weiss 1974), and  $pCO_2^{atm}$   
251 the CO<sub>2</sub> partial pressure (in atm) at the atmosphere interface, which only depends on the  
252 water vapor saturation pressure that is a function of the interface temperature and salinity  
253 (McGillis and Wanninkhof 2006). The aqueous carbon concentration  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  is computed by  
254 NEMO-PISCES (Aumont et al. 2015) from the MOCSY carbonate chemistry set of equations  
255 (Orr and Epitalon 2015) and is a function of the  $T$ ,  $S$ ,  $Alk$  and  $DIC$ . One question is to determine  
256 the depths at which  $T$ ,  $S$ ,  $Alk$  and  $DIC$  should be evaluated in the terms of (2). In the standard  
257 version of the IPSL-CM6, the air-sea carbon flux is estimated by (2) using  $T$ ,  $S$ ,  $Alk$  and  $DIC$  at  
258  $h/2$ . This classical bulk flux calculation is simply noted  $F$  (black arrow in Fig. 1b).

259 Figure 1b, illustrates how  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  and  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  vary with  $T$  and  $S$  taken at different depths  
260 for the situation depicted in Fig. 1a.  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  is an increasing function first of  $S$  and then of  $T$   
261 (see Annex and Woolf et al. 2016). Below the interface,  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  decreases with increasing  
262 depth due to the salinity increase in the MBL (Fig. a). Below the MBL base and in the absence  
263 of rain, the changes in  $S$  are weak and changes in  $T$  control the changes in  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$ . Thus,

264  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_w$  increases with depth and thus with temperature in the TBL; then, it decreases down  
265 to  $h/2$ -depth in relation to the diurnal warm layer (Fig. 1a). On the other hand,  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_i$  is a  
266 decreasing function first of temperature and then salinity (see Annex) and will depend on the  
267 depth at which temperature and salinity are evaluated. In the situation represented in Fig. 1a,  
268 with  $T_{h/2} > T_{int}$ , this lead to  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_i(T_{int}, S_{int}) > [\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_i(T_{h/2}, S_{h/2})$  (Fig. 1b).

269 The limiting step in  $\text{CO}_2$  exchanges between the ocean and the atmosphere is the diffusion  
270 of  $\text{CO}_2$  molecules in the MBL, which is the diffusive layer for salt (Bolin 1960, McGillis and  
271 Wanninkhof 2006). According to McGillis and Wanninkhof (2006), the flux should then be  
272 computed from the difference in  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations at the top (the interface) for  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_i$  and  
273 at the bottom of this layer for  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_w$ . This flux is noted  $F_{MBL}$  (red arrow in Fig.1b).

274 As underlined by Woolf et al. (2016), this formulation implicitly hypothesizes a linear  
275 temperature profile and that the chemical equilibrium is reached in the MBL. They name this  
276 hypothesis the “equilibrium model”. However, the residence time of a water parcel in the TBL  
277 is generally shorter than the timescale for chemical repartitioning of the carbonate species  
278 induced by changes in temperature and salinity, which is on the order of 10s (Dong et al. 2022,  
279 Woolf et al. 2016). Therefore, in what they name the “rapid model”, Woolf et al. (2016) argue  
280 that the TBL base temperature and salinity (Fig. 1a) account for the MBL chemical  
281 repartitioning better and should be used to compute  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_w$ . The flux computed accordingly  
282 to this “rapid model” is noted  $F_{TBL}$  (blue arrow in Fig. 1b). As the TBL base temperature is  
283 warmer than the MBL base temperature (Fig 1a), the rapid model leads to a larger waterside  
284  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration than the equilibrium model (see Annex). Therefore,  $F_{TBL}$  leads to a weaker  
285 increase in  $\text{CO}_2$  sink than  $F_{MBL}$  (Fig 1b).

286 To assess the impact of considering a uniform ocean skin (Watson et al. 2020), we  
287 introduce another diagnostic  $F_{Wat}$  (light blue arrow in Fig. 1b) for which  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_w$  is computed

288 at  $h/2$ -depth and  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_i$  is computed using empirically-based constant differences of  $-0.17\text{K}$   
 289 and  $+0.1\text{ g/kg}$  across the TBL and the MBL respectively (see Fig. 1a and b).

290 Table 1 synthesizes the different  $\text{CO}_2$  fluxes that are computed and details the  
 291 corresponding temperature and salinity that are considered. Additional diagnostics  $F_{\text{skinM}}$  and  
 292  $F_{\text{skinT}}$  are computed as  $F_{\text{MBL}}$  and  $F_{\text{TBL}}$  but neglecting  $T$  and  $S$  changes below the ocean skin.  
 293 Comparing  $F_{\text{skinM}}$  and  $F_{\text{skinT}}$  results to  $F_{\text{MBL}}$  and  $F_{\text{TBL}}$  quantifies the impact of diurnal warm layers  
 294 and rain lenses stratification within the first model layer of 1 m depth. A last diagnostic  $F_{\text{NoS}}$  is  
 295 comparable to  $F_{\text{MBL}}$  but does not take into account the limiting effect of the salty skin.

296 All the  $\text{CO}_2$  fluxes are computed online by the IPSL-CM6 model every 45 min., which  
 297 corresponds to the ocean model timestep that considers the temperature and salinity  
 298 corrections computed by Bellenger et al. (2017) during the latest coupling timestep (every 90  
 299 min.). To evaluate  $\text{Alk}$  and  $\text{DIC}$  at a given depth for the computation of  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_w$  in (2), we  
 300 assume that, near the surface,  $\text{Alk}$  and  $\text{DIC}$  differ from their value at  $h/2$ -depth only because  
 301 of concentration changes caused by rain and evaporation. We thus assume that they have the

302 same ratio of dilution as salinity and so we can write  $\frac{S_{\text{MBL}} - S_{h/2}}{S_{h/2}} = \frac{\text{Alk}_{\text{MBL}} - \text{Alk}_{h/2}}{\text{Alk}_{h/2}} =$   
 303  $\frac{\text{DIC}_{\text{MBL}} - \text{DIC}_{h/2}}{\text{DIC}_{h/2}}$ .

304 Considering the other terms in (2): We assume that the bulk transfer parameterization for  
 305  $k_w$  derived from the global  $^{14}\text{C}$  budget (Wanninkhof 2014), which is usually applied to  
 306 atmospheric and oceanic parameters, corresponding typically to 10 m height and 5 m depth,  
 307 can be used to evaluate the ocean skin effect on the carbon fluxes. The implications of this  
 308 hypothesis will be further discussed in detail in the discussion section. Note that we do not  
 309 include the rain effect on the transfer velocity (Ho et al. 1997). The Schmidt number is a  
 310 function of temperature and salinity and should be evaluated below the ocean skin (Yang et

311 al. 2022). However, evaluating it at the interface, at the MBL base or at the ocean model first  
312 level leads to very small differences (not shown). Therefore, in the following, it will always be  
313 evaluated at the ocean model first level ( $T_{h/2}$  and  $S_{h/2}$ ).

314

## 315 2.4 Simulations

316 Two 15-year IPSL-CM6 simulations with imposed global-mean atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>  
317 concentration corresponding to present-day conditions (years 2000 to 2014) were performed.  
318 We repeated the last 15 years of the CMIP6 historical simulations with IPSL-CM6A-LR (scenario  
319 starts from 2015), using the r1i1p1f1 member available on ESGF as initial conditions for  
320 January 2000 (Boucher et al. 2020, link in the data availability section). Both simulations use  
321 the IPSL-CM6 model (CMIP6 version) with the Bellenger et al. (2017) parameterization  
322 included. In contrast with the CMIP6 version of the model, the Bellenger et al. (2017)  
323 parameterization was used to compute the sensible and latent heat and the infrared fluxes.  
324 In the diagnostic (DIAG) simulation, the prognostic CO<sub>2</sub> flux used to compute the evolution of  
325 the oceanic carbon was from the classical bulk formulation  $F$  and the CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes deduced from  
326 other formulations were calculated only as diagnostics (Table 1). In the coupled (CPL)  
327 simulation, the  $F_{MBL}$  carbon flux was used to compute the evolution of oceanic carbon so that  
328 the new parameterization affected the simulated ocean carbon cycle. Because the equilibrium  
329 model ( $F_{MBL}$ ) leads to a larger adjustment than the rapid model ( $F_{TBL}$ ), this will provide an upper  
330 limit of the impact of the ocean skin on CO<sub>2</sub> flux in a coupled framework. We indicate the  
331 considered simulation using a superscript on the CO<sub>2</sub> flux notation (for example,  $F^{DIAG}$ ).

332

## 333 **3. Results**

334

335                    3.1 Air-Sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes

336                    Figure 2 compares CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from the DIAG simulation to the SeaFlux data product of  
337 Fay et al. (2021). The mean CO<sub>2</sub> flux  $F^{DIAG}$  over 2000-2014 (Fig.2a) shows a latitudinal pattern  
338 consistent with SeaFlux (Fig. 2b). Main outgassing regions are found in tropical and sub-  
339 tropical oceans with fluxes down to -30 g C m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in the eastern Equatorial Pacific. The ocean  
340 acts mainly as a sink for subtropical and mid-latitude regions with maxima reaching +40 g C  
341 m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> locally in the Southern Ocean and in the storm track regions. There are some large  
342 local biases such as in the northern Pacific Ocean where the sink is overestimated by the  
343 model by up to +20 g C m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> and in the equatorial ocean where the outgassing is  
344 underestimated in a comparable manner (Fig. 2c). Overall, the global oceanic CO<sub>2</sub> sink  
345 simulated by our model in the DIAG simulation (Fig. 2d black thin line) is underestimated  
346 compared to the Global Carbon Budget (GCB) estimate that includes both models and data  
347 products or only the latter (*resp.* bold dashed black and green lines, Friedlingstein et al. 2022).  
348 The CPL simulation only slightly reduces the underestimation of the global sink by the model  
349 (Fig. 2d black thin dashed line). In addition, neither DIAG nor CPL actually reproduce the  
350 increasing tendency in the global oceanic sink (less than +0.01 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup> vs +0.06 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup> for  
351 GCB during 2000-2014).

352

353                    3.2 Near-surface T and S vertical gradients

354                    Figure 3 shows the distributions of temperature differences across the TBL, and salinity  
355 differences across the MBL and between the base of these layers and the oceanic mixed  
356 layer taken at 3 m. The values were obtained using the Bellenger et al. (2017)  
357 parameterization in IPSL-CM6 (solid lines) and the same parameterization forced by ERA5  
358 (dashed lines). Note that, in our model, the temperature difference across the MBL is

359 about 1/5<sup>th</sup> of the difference across the TBL. First, the distributions produced by IPSL-CM6  
360 and diagnosed from ERA5 are in good agreement, except for slightly more frequent  
361 temperature differences below -0.4K across the TBL in IPSL-CM6 (Fig. 3a). The global mean  
362 differences in salinity and temperature across MBL and TBL are 0.06 g/kg and -0.23K for  
363 IPSL-CM6 and 0.07 g/kg and -0.17K for ERA5. These values are comparable with the values  
364 of 0.1 g/kg and -0.17K chosen by Watson et al. (2020) based on in situ measurements by  
365 Donlon et al. (2002). Below the ocean skin, the change in temperature and salinity due to  
366 warm layers and rain lenses are generally an order of magnitude lower than changes in  
367 the ocean skin, with mean differences on the order of 10<sup>-2</sup> K for temperature and 10<sup>-3</sup> g/kg  
368 for salinity. Therefore, and as it will be shown in the next section and consistently with  
369 Woolf et al. (2016), the difference in the global ocean CO<sub>2</sub> sink due to near-surface *T* and  
370 *S* vertical gradients from Bellenger et al. (2017) is mainly due to the ocean skin.

371 Figure 4 shows the maps of mean temperature and salinity differences across their  
372 respective diffusive boundary layers (TBL and MBL) in IPSL-CM6 and ERA5. Spatial  
373 distributions of the cooling and increase in salinity in the TBL and MBL by IPSL-CM6 and  
374 ERA5 are in close agreement except for the high latitudes where the model is producing  
375 too strong a cooling (Fig. 4a and b). There is no such overestimation in salinity increase  
376 across the MBL at high latitudes (Fig. 4c and d). In fact, at high latitudes in the model,  
377 strong cooling of the sea surface by infrared radiation and sensible heat flux gives a  
378 stronger cool skin (around -0.4K) that is not associated with a clear increase in salinity  
379 across the MBL. The difference in temperature across the TBL is stronger than the -0.17K  
380 chosen by Watson et al. (2020) almost everywhere in the tropics and subtropics. A similar  
381 feature is visible for the change in salinity across the MBL (Fig. 4c and d), which is  
382 frequently stronger than the 0.1 g/kg threshold in the tropical and subtropical regions

383 except for the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) region. In the ITCZ, frequent rain and  
384 light winds lead to a fresh ocean skin with  $S_{Int} - S_{MBL} \sim -0.1$  g/kg and a cool skin of -0.3K. In  
385 the subtropics, large evaporation and stronger wind speed may lead to large positive  $S_{Int} -$   
386  $S_{MBL} \sim +0.3$  g/kg and a cool skin of -0.4K. Finally, in the mid-latitudes, high wind speeds  
387 induce strong mixing that largely reduces the TBL and MBL effects.

388

### 389 3.3 Impacts on air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes - diagnostics

390 The annual mean global ocean carbon sinks, estimated from the DIAG simulation for  
391 the standard flux ( $F^{DIAG}$ ), for the different diagnostics ( $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$ ,  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$ ,  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$ ,  $F_{SkinM}^{DIAG}$ ,  
392  $F_{SkinT}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{NoS}^{DIAG}$ ) and the corresponding differences with  $F^{DIAG}$  are reported in Table 1.  
393 The increase in the global ocean carbon sink from the diagnosed fluxes ranges from +0.26  
394 to +0.39 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>, which is 13-19% of the standard sink of 2.04 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>.

395 In the following, we will focus on  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$ ,  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$ , which are reported in  
396 Figure 5. First, the global sink computed from  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  (+0.37 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) increases more than  
397 the one computed from  $F_{TBL}^{CT}$  (+0.26 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>). This is because the former includes the  
398 effect of a large part of the cool skin on  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$ , which is an increasing function of  $T$   
399 (Annex). The equilibrium model gives a sink strengthening 40% larger than with the rapid  
400 model. Using the rapid model but uniform ocean skin  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  leads to stronger sink (+0.33  
401 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) than with the interactive ocean skin  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  (+0.26 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>). The difference in the  
402 adjustments using  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$ ,  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  are statistically significant (to the 99.9%  
403 level, see the standard deviations in the last column of Table 1). The three flux estimates  
404 induce an additional sink that increases with time at a rate of  $+1.5 \times 10^{-3}$  PgC yr<sup>-2</sup> (Fig. 5b),  
405 which is comparable to the  $+2.5 \times 10^{-3}$  PgC yr<sup>-2</sup> obtained by Dong et al. (2022). Figure 5c  
406 shows the seasonal variations of hemispherical CO<sub>2</sub> sink with maxima during the

407 corresponding hemisphere's winter.  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  shows weaker seasonal variations than  
408  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  in both hemispheres. In addition, the overestimation of the global sink  
409 when using a uniform ocean skin ( $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  vs  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$ ) is mainly due to an overestimation of  
410 the sink in the southern hemisphere. The hemispherical sinks variations largely  
411 compensate to result in a weak seasonal variation of the global sink.

412 Figure 6 compares  $F^{DIAG}$  to the three alternative estimates  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$ ,  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$ .  
413 These estimates increase the ocean CO<sub>2</sub> sink everywhere with some specific patterns.  
414  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  increases CO<sub>2</sub> sink especially in the tropical and subtropical oceans (Fig. 6b). This  
415 increase is particularly marked in the trade winds regions of the western Pacific and  
416 Atlantic Oceans and, for the mid-latitudes, in the Gulf Stream, the Kuroshio, and the  
417 Agulhas Current regions. Because the cool skin temperature difference is not a function of  
418 wind alone, there is no simple relationship between the flux adjustment in Fig. 6b neither  
419 with the mean cool skin shown in Fig. 4a nor with the wind speed as it is discussed in  
420 section 4.3. However, regions of very large cool skin, like the warm pool and polar regions,  
421 correspond to weak flux adjustment because the strong cool skin are associated with very  
422 low wind speed. Although weaker, the adjustment using  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  shows a comparable  
423 pattern (Fig. 6c). In contrast, applying  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  would increase CO<sub>2</sub> sink in the mid-to-high  
424 latitudes (40N-70N and 40S-70S, Fig. 6d), especially in the Southern Ocean where  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$   
425 would lead to an increase in air-sea carbon fluxes that exceed 10% of the mean annual  
426 carbon flux (Fig. 6a). Mid-to-high latitudes regions are characterized by relatively high  
427 winds and intense near-surface turbulence that largely erodes the temperature gradient  
428 within the TBL to cooling weaker than -0.1K (Fig. 4a) and thus weaker than -0.17K. Strong  
429 winds also increase the CO<sub>2</sub> flux by increasing the gas transfer velocity  $k_w$  in (2). Therefore,  
430 in IPSL-CM6 and using the rapid model assumption, using a constant difference of -0.17K

431 following Watson et al. (2020) would result in an overestimate of the impact of the cool  
432 skin on CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in mid-to-high latitudes (+1 to +2 g C m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> in the Southern Ocean, Fig.  
433 6b and c), as well as on the global CO<sub>2</sub> sink (Table 1, +0.33 Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup> for  $F_{Wat}$  vs +0.26 Pg C  
434 yr<sup>-1</sup> for  $F_{TBL}$ ).

435 The spatial distribution of  $F^{DIAG}$  carbon flux shows a clear seasonality with a large  
436 carbon sink in the mid-to-high latitudes of the winter hemisphere where stronger winds  
437 blow (Fig. 7a and b). Furthermore, Figure 7 c-f show the spatial pattern behind the  
438 hemispherical variation of the CO<sub>2</sub> sink of Fig. 5c.  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  increase the CO<sub>2</sub> sink  
439 mainly in the winter hemisphere, with maxima in the subtropical Gulf Stream and Kuroshio  
440 regions in boreal winter (Fig. 7c and e), with weak increase is observed in the tropical and  
441 subtropical regions of the summer hemisphere (Fig. 7d and f). In contrast,  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  shows  
442 seasonal variability that is stronger higher latitudes in the northern Atlantic and Pacific  
443 oceans in DJF and in the Southern Ocean in JJA (+2 to +3 g C m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) (Fig. 7g and h). The  
444 increase in CO<sub>2</sub> sink in the tropics does not show comparable equatorial asymmetry and  
445 the Southern Ocean adjustment remains a non-negligible part of the average carbon flux  
446 in DJF (+1 to +2 g C m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>) explaining the weaker seasonal variations in Figure 5c.

447 When comparing the increase in the carbon sink with (i.e.,  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  for the equilibrium  
448 model and  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  for the rapid model) and without (i.e.,  $F_{SkinM}^{DIAG}$  for the equilibrium  
449 model and  $F_{SkinT}^{DIAG}$  for the rapid model) taking into account the sub-skin temperature and  
450 salinity variations above  $h/2$ -depth shows that, as expected from Fig. 3, the effect of  
451 unresolved warm layers and rain lenses is minimal for an ocean model with 1 m resolution  
452 at the surface, resulting in a reduction of the sink by only -0.02 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>. This difference is  
453 mainly due to warm layer formation in the equatorial oceans (not shown). In addition,  
454 comparing the  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{NoS}^{DIAG}$  sinks shows that the compensating effect of the saline

455 skin on the global CO<sub>2</sub> sink is also weak (-0.02 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) and mainly located in tropical  
456 regions where  $S_{int}-S_{MBL}$  is large (Fig. 4c).

### 457 3.4 Impacts on air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes - prognostic

458 In the previous section, we showed the impact of the ocean skin on air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes  
459 diagnostics that do not impact the ocean carbon budget. In this section, we compare air-  
460 sea carbon fluxes from  $F^{DIAG}$  to those from a coupled (CPL) simulation in which  $F_{MBL}^{CPL}$  is  
461 used to compute the evolution of DIC in the ocean model. Because the associated  
462 feedback is clearly negative, an attenuated effect is to be expected. Figure 8a shows the  
463 2000-2014 global ocean carbon sink in DIAG and CPL simulations using the respective  
464 prognostic fluxes  $F^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{MBL}^{CPL}$  as well as their difference (also in Table 1). In CPL, the  
465 ocean carbon sink is increased by about +0.13 ( $\pm 0.09$ ) Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup> compared to DIAG (Figure  
466 8a). This is only about 35% of the ocean sink augmentation diagnosed for  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  (+0.37  
467  $\pm 7 \cdot 10^{-3}$  Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup>). In addition, one can note that the year-to-year standard deviation of the  
468  $F_{MBL}^{CPL} - F_{blk}^{DIAG}$  resulting global ocean sink is large and about +0.09 Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup>. This is  
469 comparable to the standard deviations of the global ocean sink diagnosed from either  
470 DIAG or CPL and larger than the year-to-year standard deviations of the adjustment  
471 diagnosed in DIAG. This is because using  $F_{MBL}$  instead of  $F$  as a prognostic carbon flux  
472 modifies the simulated marine biogeochemistry that feedbacks on the ocean heat budget  
473 through a biophysical coupling (Lengaigne et al. 2009) and on the simulated climate so  
474 that the DIAG and CPL simulations diverge. This divergence manifests itself through  
475 difference in patterns and timing of atmospheric dynamical synoptic perturbations in  
476 particular at mid-to-high latitudes. This results in larger differences in CO<sub>2</sub> flux variability  
477 in these regions (Fig. 8b, the black curve and its standard deviation). Because of this  
478 divergence of the two simulations, we only show zonal mean profiles of the CO<sub>2</sub> flux and

479 ocean model first level pCO<sub>2</sub> differences in Figure 8b (shadings represent their year-to-  
480 year variability). The use of  $F_{MBL}^{CPL}$  tends to increase the ocean carbon sink at almost all  
481 latitudes. This increase in CO<sub>2</sub> flux is only significant to the 95% confidence level. However,  
482 the increase in the first level of pCO<sub>2</sub> is significant in the tropics (Fig.8b, the red curve).  
483 There is an accumulation of carbon at the ocean surface in the CPL simulation. This can  
484 explain the limitation of the increase in the carbon sink when using  $F_{MBL}$  rather than  $F$  as  
485 prognostic flux. Therefore, taking into account all interaction loops and depending on the  
486 ability of the ocean model to transfer the carbon into the ocean interior, the use of  $F_{MBL}$   
487 leads to a significantly weaker adjustment in a coupled framework than what could be  
488 inferred from a simple offline diagnostic.

489

## 490 **4 Discussion**

491

### 492 4.1 Uncertainties due to the ocean skin representation

493 A first source of uncertainty is the representation of the ocean skin. Assuming a linear  
494 dependency of the CO<sub>2</sub> sink adjustment to the temperature difference in the TBL and using  
495 the mean difference of 0.06K between IPSL-CM6 and ERA5 estimates lead to an  
496 uncertainty of  $\pm 0.07$  PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>. Taking into account this uncertainty, the adjustment using a  
497 uniform ocean skin with the diagnostic flux  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  (+0.33 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) although weaker is not  
498 significantly different than the adjustment found by Watson et al. (2020,  $+0.4 \pm 0.04$  PgC  
499 yr<sup>-1</sup>) and Dong et al. (2022,  $+0.39 \pm 0.08$  PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>). The adjustment found with an interactive  
500 ocean skin and the rapid model with the diagnostic flux  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  (+0.26 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) is also on  
501 the same order of magnitude because part of this difference is due to unresolved warm  
502 layers (-0.02 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) and salinity skin (-0.02 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) effects that are not taken into

503 account by previous studies. Surprisingly, whereas we find a significant sensitivity of the  
504 adjustment to considering an interactive ocean skin or not ( $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  vs  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$ ), Dong et al.  
505 (2022) and Watson et al. (2020) adjustments are very close to each other. This is partly  
506 explained by the fact that Dong et al. (2022) do not consider warm layer and salty skin  
507 corrections that would tend to reduce the adjustment. This may also arise from the use of  
508 monthly mean parameter in computing the adjustment.

#### 509 4.2 Uncertainties due to the chemical equilibrium

510 A second uncertainty comes from the chemical equilibrium assumption at the base of  
511 the MBL. The difference between the equilibrium model  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  and the rapid model  
512  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  (+0.11 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) is a measure of this uncertainty. As discussed by Dong et al. (2022)  
513 and Woolf et al. (2016), the residence time of a water parcel in the TBL is generally on the  
514 order of 1 s. This is shorter than the 10 s timescale of the chemical repartitioning of the  
515 carbonate species that is induced by changes in temperature and salinity. This is the  
516 reason why they recommend the rapid model that takes the temperature at the base of  
517 the TBL to represent the actual chemical repartitioning at the base of the MBL and  
518 compute  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  in (2). However, they also note that the residence time of a water parcel  
519 can be longer under weak wind conditions: It can reach about 6 s for a 2 ms<sup>-1</sup> wind speed  
520 (Garbe et al. 2004) and might even be longer due to the stabilizing effect of sunlight. These  
521 conditions are frequent in the tropics which may make the equilibrium hypothesis more  
522 suitable there. It is also where the difference between  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  adjustments is  
523 the largest (Fig. 6b and c). The actual flux adjustment due to ocean skin is therefore  
524 certainly in between the results obtained for  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  and  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$ . Refining the ocean skin  
525 parameterization to take into account the residence time of water parcel and the

526 kinematics of the chemical repartitioning of the carbonate system could help reduce this  
527 uncertainty.

#### 528 4.3 Cool skin as a function of wind speed only

529 Because the cool skin mainly depends on the wind speed (Donlon et al. 2002), the use  
530 of a wind-only parameterization may appear sufficient to represent the cool skin effect in  
531 models. Figure 9a shows the mean temperature difference across the TBL computed by  
532 Bellenger et al. (2017) as a function of the model wind speed at 10 m. The large standard  
533 deviation in Fig. 9 shows that the modeled cool skin does not only depend on wind speed  
534 but also on other factors such as air-sea gradients in temperature and humidity (e.g. Luo  
535 and Minnett 2020). Figure 9b shows the mean annual difference between the cool skin  
536 temperature computed either by the Bellenger et al. (2017) parameterization or from the  
537 mean wind-only relationship shown in Figure 9a. A striking result is that large regions of  
538 negative and positive anomalies appear on this annual mean map (Fig. 9b). Negative  
539 anomalies mean that the average cool skin is stronger than the one deduced from the  
540 wind-only relationship, and vice versa. In absolute value, these mean anomalies can be of  
541 the order of magnitude as the cool skin effect ( $\sim 0.1\text{K}$ , Fig. 9b, Fig. 4a and b). If a mean wind  
542 dependency of the cool skin (Fig 9a) such as Donlon et al. (2002) is used to represent the  
543 cool skin effect in a model, it would lead to such regional biases in temperature at the  
544 interface and thus to regional errors in  $\text{CO}_2$  fluxes of the order of magnitude discussed  
545 previously (Fig. 6b and c).

#### 546 4.4 Uncertainties due to the $\text{CO}_2$ transfer velocity

547 This study is based on the assumption that the widely used bulk flux formulation of the  
548 transfer velocity  $k_w$  in (2) that is derived from measurements in the bulk of water and air  
549 (see Wanninkhof et al. 2009 for a review) do not implicitly take into account the cool skin

550 effect and can therefore be applied to study the impact of the ocean skin on the CO<sub>2</sub> flux.  
551 Dong et al. (2022) argued that global  $k_w$  based on <sup>14</sup>C inventory is not sensitive to the ocean  
552 skin correction due to the large air-sea <sup>14</sup>C difference. The same argument stands for in  
553 situ measurements based on <sup>3</sup>He/SF<sub>6</sub> dual-tracers (e.g., Ho et al. 2006, Y. Dong personal  
554 communication). Therefore, the usual  $k_w$  formulation appears to be suitable to study the  
555 ocean skin effect as it has been implicitly hypothesized in previous studies (Robertson and  
556 Watson 1992, McGillis and Wanninkhof 2006, Woolf et al. 2016, and Watson et al. 2020).

557 However, the bulk  $k_w$  accounts for a variety of processes such as exchanges mediated  
558 by bubbles, sea sprays and whitecaps associated with wave breaking. These processes  
559 become important for moderate winds (Fairall et al. 2000, Hare et al. 2004, Woolf et al.  
560 2019). Because, these processes do not depend on the molecular microlayers, the use of  
561 a bulk transfer coefficient may lead to an overestimation of the associated CO<sub>2</sub> flux  
562 adjustment. In order to apply the ocean skin correction only to the part of the exchange  
563 mediated by the molecular sublayer, it seems suitable to treat separately the different CO<sub>2</sub>  
564 transfer processes.

565

## 566 5 Conclusions

567 This study explored the impact of thermal and saline gradients in the ocean skin on  
568 global atmosphere-ocean CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes. To achieve this, a global model with interactive  
569 temperature and salinity changes in the thermal and mass boundary layers (TBL and MBL)  
570 and the first layer of the ocean model (Bellenger et al. 2017) was used. These changes  
571 observed were dominated by temperature and salinity variations in their respective  
572 diffusive boundary layers, with an average increase in salinity of +0.06 g/kg and a decrease

573 in temperature of -0.23K. These results were consistent with those obtained by using ERA5  
574 to force the parameterization of the ocean skin.

575 Using a bulk formulation of the CO<sub>2</sub> flux (McGillis and Wanninkhof 2006, Woolf et al.  
576 2016), several flux diagnostics are computed using temperature and salinity at different  
577 depths with or without (i) assuming the chemical equilibrium at the base of the MBL, (ii)  
578 considering an interactive ocean skin, (iii) taking into account unresolved gradients below  
579 the microlayer in the ocean model's first level and (iv) taking into account the salinity skin  
580 (Table 1). These diagnostics are consistent with previous studies (Woolf et al. 2016 and  
581 2019, Watson et al. 2020, Shutler et al. 2020, Dong et al. 2022). It was however possible  
582 to reveal the sensitivity of the adjustment to these different assumptions: Depending on  
583 the assumption of whether the chemical equilibrium is reached at the base of the MBL  
584 ( $F_{MBL}$ ) or not ( $F_{TBL}$ ) leads to diagnostic global CO<sub>2</sub> sink adjustment of +0.37 and +0.26 Pg yr<sup>-1</sup>,  
585 respectively. With a 1-m surface resolution ocean model, the unresolved warm layers  
586 and rain lenses only account for a reduction of the adjustment of -0.02 PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>,  
587 comparable to the impact of the salty skin. Uniform ocean skin ( $F_{Wat}$ ) lead to regional  
588 biases in the modeled CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes (+1 to +2 Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup> in the Southern Ocean, Fig. 6) and in  
589 the global sink (+0.33 against +0.26 Pg C yr<sup>-1</sup>). This could impact the simulated carbon cycle  
590 and the representation of pathways of anthropogenic carbon, in particular, in the  
591 Southern Ocean where the vertical mixing induces large carbon subduction (e.g., Bopp et  
592 al. 2015). More importantly, ocean skin adjustment in a coupled model is weaker than  
593 diagnostic estimates. Indeed, we show that taking into account retroaction loops by  
594 enabling the ocean skin to feedback on ocean carbon concentrations dampens the  
595 magnitude of this adjustment to +0.13 (±0.09) PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>. Although significantly weaker than  
596 previous diagnostics, and although this adjustment obtained assuming the equilibrium

597 model constitutes an upper limit, this remains a non-negligible impact on the global ocean  
598 carbon sink (on the order of 5%) with regional signature and it is linked to a change of the  
599 modeled mean surface pCO<sub>2</sub>. The magnitude of these changes ultimately depends on the  
600 capacity of the ocean model to transfer CO<sub>2</sub> in its interior.

601 Future modeling efforts should thus take into account the ocean skin impact on CO<sub>2</sub>  
602 flux. An interactive parameterization of the ocean skin appears to be necessary to prevent  
603 regional errors in CO<sub>2</sub> flux. As a next step, a detailed flux parameterization (e.g., Fairall et  
604 al. 2000) should be tested in climate models because the ocean skin adjustment would be  
605 only applied to the exchanges mediated by the molecular microlayer. This should further  
606 reduce the impact of the ocean skin on the modeled CO<sub>2</sub> sink. Note that this effort to  
607 separate the different process, that are not all sensitive to the ocean skin, seems also  
608 important for observation assessments of global CO<sub>2</sub> sink. This may as well reduce the  
609 diagnosed impact of ocean skin on the global sink compared to previous estimates  
610 (Watson et al. 2020, Dong et al. 2022). On the other hand, taking into account the  
611 kinematics of chemical repartitioning of the carbonate species with temperature and  
612 salinity (Woolf et al. 2016) could increase the ocean skin effect in the tropics and thus the  
613 adjustment of the global sink.

614

#### 615 **Acknowledgments:**

616 The authors would like to thank the editor, Yuanxu Dong and two anonymous reviewers for  
617 their constructive comments and suggestions which helped us improve the present article.

618 Part of this research is made in the framework of the COCOA project (French National Agency  
619 for Research, ANR) and the EUREC4A-OA project (French INSU LEFE/IMAGO and LEFE/GMMC  
620 programs and JPI Ocean and Climate). Collaborations with JAMSTEC are supported by the

621 CLOSS project funded by the PHC SAKURA program (French Ministry of Foreign Affairs).  
622 Laëtitia Parc's Ph.D. is partly funded by the Chanel Research Chair: Understanding the Linkages  
623 between the Ocean, the Carbon Cycle, and Marine Ecosystems under Climate Change. Laurent  
624 Bopp acknowledges funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation  
625 program under grant agreement no. 821003 (project 4C).  
626

627 **Annex - Sensitivity of CO<sub>2</sub> flux to ocean near-surface temperature and salinity changes.**

628 We derive an approximate formula for the change in carbon flux due to perturbations  
 629 in temperature and salinity near the ocean surface. This will provide a synthesis of the  
 630 different sensitivities of the main terms of equation (2) to  $T$  and  $S$  discussed in Woolf et al.  
 631 (2016) and their order of magnitudes. In the following, we assume that the aqueous carbonate  
 632 system is in chemical equilibrium for a given environment (that is for given  $T$ ,  $S$ ,  $DIC$  and  $Alk$ ).

633 Neglecting the sensitivity of the Schmidt number on temperature for changes of at  
 634 most a few degrees that are considered here, and supposing no change in the wind, the total  
 635 derivative of the flux reads:

$$636 \quad dF = k_w \sqrt{660/Sc(T)} [d[CO_{2aq}]_i(T, S) - d[CO_{2aq}]_w(T, S, DIC, Alk)] \quad (A1)$$

637 The total derivative of  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  can be directly derived using formula from Weiss (1974) and  
 638 provided by McGillis and Wanninkhof (2006). The total derivative for  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$ , which reflects  
 639 a change in aqueous CO<sub>2</sub> due to chemical processes, reads:

$$640 \quad d[CO_{2aq}]_w = dT \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial T} + dS \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial S} + dAlk \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial Alk} + dDIC \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial DIC} \quad (A2)$$

641 We make the hypothesis that near the surface,  $Alk$  and  $DIC$  only change by dilution:

$$642 \quad dAlk \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial Alk} = Alk \frac{dS}{S} \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial Alk} \quad (A3)$$

643 Noting that the solubility  $K_0$  is not a function of  $Alk$  and  $DIC$  and introducing  $\gamma_{Alk}$  and  $\gamma_{DIC}$  the  
 644 sensitivity of  $pCO_{2w}$  to  $Alk$  and  $DIC$ , the two last terms in (A2) can be written:

$$645 \quad dAlk \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial Alk} + dDIC \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial DIC} = dS (K_0 \frac{pCO_{2w}}{S} \gamma_{Alk} + K_0 \frac{pCO_{2w}}{S} \gamma_{DIC}) \quad (A4)$$

646 Using approximations in Sarmiento and Gruber (2006), it comes that  $\gamma_{Alk} + \gamma_{DIC} = 1$  and thus  
 647 substituting (A4) in (A2) leads to:

$$648 \quad d[CO_{2aq}]_w = dT \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial T} + \left( \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial S} + K_0 \cdot \frac{pCO_{2w}}{S} \right) dS \quad (A5)$$

649 Using the relationship of  $pCO_{2w}$  mean sensitivity to temperature and salinity given by  
 650 Takahashi et al. (2009) leads to:

$$651 \quad d[CO_{2aq}]_w = \left( \frac{\partial K_0}{\partial T} + \gamma_T K_0 \right) pCO_{2w} dT + \left( \frac{\partial K_0}{\partial S} + \frac{2K_0}{S} \right) pCO_{2w} dS \quad (A6)$$

652 This last equation enables to make a simple estimate of the sensitivities of  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  to changes  
 653 in temperature ( $dT$ ) and salinity ( $dS$ ) for given values of  $T$ ,  $S$  and  $pCO_{2w}$ .

654 In order to illustrate the validity of our approximation to represent changes in the  
 655 water-side  $CO_2$  concentration near the surface, we show on Figure A1 a scatterplot of the  
 656  $d[CO_{2aq}]_w$  approximated from (A6) and computed using  $dT=T_{int}-T_{h/2}$  and  $dS=S_{int}-S_{h/2}$  as a  
 657 function of  $d[CO_{2aq}]_w = [CO_{2aq}]_w(T_{int}, S_{int}, DIC_{int}, Alk_{int}) -$   
 658  $[CO_{2aq}]_w(T_{h/2}, S_{h/2}, DIC_{h/2}, Alk_{h/2})$  computed by the IPSL-CM6 model following MOCSY set  
 659 of equations (Orr and Epitalon 2015). Note that we compute the difference to a hypothetical  
 660 interfacial  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  in order to have larger differences in  $T$  and  $S$  (see Fig 3). Although slightly  
 661 overestimating the change in  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$ , (A6) is a good approximation where the sea  
 662 temperature is above  $0^\circ C$  (and even better in relatively warm waters).

663 Figure A2 shows the sensitivity of  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  and  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  to Temperature and Salinity  
 664 (respectively divided by the atmospheric  $CO_2$  mole fraction and  $pCO_{2w}$ ) and their ratio. The  
 665 interface concentration  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  is a decreasing function of both temperature and salinity (Fig.  
 666 A2a and c). Its temperature sensitivity is 4-6 times larger than to salinity (Fig. A2e). This means  
 667 that an increase of 0.6 g/kg in  $S_{int}$  is needed to offset a decrease of -0.1K in  $T_{int}$ . This is rarely  
 668 the case, so usually the dominating effect is an increase of  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  due to the cool skin. On the  
 669 other hand,  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  is an increasing function of temperature and salinity (Fig. A2b and d). Its  
 670 sensitivity to salinity is 3 to 10 times larger than its sensitivity to temperature (Fig. A2f). This  
 671 ratio increases up to 17 with decreasing temperature to  $0^\circ C$ , but our approximation does not

672 hold in cold Polar regions (Fig. A1). If  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  is evaluated at the base of the MBL (in  $F_{MBL}$ ), the  
673 variations in  $T$  and  $S$  that can influence it are changes below the TBL and MBL ( $T_{TBL}-T_d$  and  $S_{MBL}-$   
674  $S_d$ ) and changes in the cool skin below the MBL ( $T_{TBL}-T_{MBL}$ ). The former is due to diurnal warm  
675 layer formation or rain-induced freshening and cooling. Because these differences are usually  
676 weak in our simulations (Fig. 3) they only affect  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  locally. The latter corresponds in our  
677 simulations to  $4/5^{th}$  of  $T_{int}-T_{TBL}$ , the entire cool skin effect, and induces a decrease in  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$ .  
678 Finally, an increase in  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  and a decrease in  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  together induce the obtained increase  
679 in the global carbon sink (Figure 5a, the red bar). For  $F_{TBL}$ , the main impact (except for warm  
680 layers and rain lenses) is the increase in  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  with decreasing  $T$ .

681 Note that, considering only the impact of temperature on  $CO_2$  flux (A1) leads to :

$$682 \quad F_{MBL} - F = k_w \sqrt{660/Sc(T)} [(T_{Int} - T_{h/2}) \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_i}{\partial T} - (T_{MBL} - T_{h/2}) \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial T}] \quad (A7)$$

683 That can be rearranged to

$$684 \quad F_{MBL} - F = k_w \sqrt{660/Sc(T)} [(T_{Int} - T_{h/2}) \left( \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_i}{\partial T} - \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial T} \right) + (T_{Int} - T_{MBL}) \frac{\partial [CO_{2aq}]_w}{\partial T}]$$


685 (A8)

686 The first term in the parenthesis is positive, the second is negative. Therefore, the flux  
687 adjustment due to  $F_{MBL}$  increase when  $T_{MBL}$  tends to  $T_{int}$  (or if the MBL becomes thinner).  
688 Therefore, unlike discussed in McGillis and Wanninkhof (2006) and as discussed by Woolf et  
689 al. (2016), a thinner MBL would lead to a stronger  $F_{MBL}$  flux adjustment with a maximum value  
690 given by the total temperature difference in the ocean skin ( $T_{int} - T_{h/2}$ ) that is reached for  $T_{MBL}$   
691  $= T_{int}$ .

692

693 **Data availability statement**

694 The ocean skin parameterization (Bellenger et al. 2017) is open-access and can be downloaded  
695 at <https://gitlab.in2p3.fr/ipsl/lmd/dpao/ocean-skin>. The CMIP6 historical simulations with  
696 IPSL-CM6A-LR (and in particular the r1i1p1f1 member) are available on ESGF: [https://esgf-  
698 node.ipsl.upmc.fr/search/cmip6-ipsl/](https://esgf-<br/>697 node.ipsl.upmc.fr/search/cmip6-ipsl/). Surface ERA5 hourly data can be accessed from  
699 [https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/reanalysis-era5-single-  
701 levels?tab=overview](https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/cdsapp#!/dataset/reanalysis-era5-single-<br/>700 levels?tab=overview). Daily CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from DIAG ad CPL simulations and temperature and  
702 salinity changes in the ocean skin from DIAG can be found  
703 <https://zenodo.org/record/7731926>




704

705 **Figure A1.** Differences in the aqueous carbon concentration  $[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_{\text{w}}$  in  $\text{mmol m}^{-3}$  between  
 706 the interface and  $h/2$  approximated from (A6) using  $dT = T_{\text{int}} - T_{h/2}$  and  $dS = S_{\text{int}} - S_{h/2}$  and IPSL-CM6  
 707 outputs ( $d[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_{\text{w}}$  approx.) and directly calculated by IPSL-CM6 ( $d[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_{\text{w}}$  IPSL-CM6). Color is  
 708 the ocean model first level temperature (grey dots for temperatures below  $0^{\circ}\text{C}$ ). The linear fit  
 709 is also plotted.

710

711



712

713 **Figure A2.** Sensitivity of the interfacial carbon concentration  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  divided by the  
 714 atmospheric concentration of  $CO_2$  ( $xCO_2$ , a and c) and the aqueous carbon concentration  
 715  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  divided by the  $CO_2$  partial pressure in water ( $pCO_{2w}$ , b and d) to temperature (a and  
 716 b) and Salinity (c and d) and the ratio of these sensitivities for (e)  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  and (f)  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  as a  
 717 function of temperature and salinity. The sensitivities of  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  and  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  to  $T$  and  $S$  are  
 718 respectively in  $\text{mol m}^{-3} \text{atm}^{-1} \text{K}^{-1}$  and  $\text{mol m}^{-3} \text{atm}^{-1} (\text{g/kg})^{-1}$ ,  $pCO_{2w}$  in atm and  $xCO_2$  the  
 719 atmospheric  $CO_2$  mole fraction in mol/mol. The sensitivities of  $[CO_{2aq}]_i$  are from Weiss  
 720 formulation and the sensitivities of  $[CO_{2aq}]_w$  are computed from (A6).

721 **References**

722 *Aumont, O., Ethé, C., Tagliabue, A., Bopp, L., & Gehlen, M. (2015). PISCES-v2: an ocean*  
723 *biogeochemical model for carbon and ecosystem studies. Geophys. Mod. Dev., 8(2465-2513).*  
724 *doi:10.5194/gmd-8-2465-2015*

725 *Banzon V., T. M. Smith, T. M. Chin, C. Liu, and W. Hankins, 2016, A long-term record of*  
726 *blended satellite and in situ sea-surface temperature for climate monitoring, modeling and*  
727 *environmental studies, Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 8, 165-176, doi:10.5194/essd-8-165-2016*

728 *Bellenger H. and J. P. Duvel, 2009: An analysis of ocean diurnal warm layers over tropical*  
729 *oceans, J. Climate, 22, 3629-3646.*

730 *Bellenger H., K. Drushka, W. E. Asher, G. Reverdin, M. Katsumata, and M. Watanabe, 2017:*  
731 *Extension of the prognostic model of sea surface temperature to rain-induced cool and fresh*  
732 *lenses, J. Geophys. Res. Oceans, 122, 484–507, doi:10.1002/2016JC012429.*

733 *Bakker, D. C. and coauthors, 2016: A multi-decade record of high-quality fCO<sub>2</sub> data in*  
734 *version 3 of the Surface Ocean CO<sub>2</sub> Atlas (SOCAT), Earth Syst. Sci. Data, 8, 383– 413,*  
735 *<https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-8-383-2016>*

736 *Bolin, B., 1960: On the exchange of carbon dioxide between the atmosphere and the sea,*  
737 *Tellus 12(3), 274-281.*

738 *Boucher, O., and coauthors, 2020: Presentation and evaluation of the IPSL-CM6A-LR*  
739 *climate model, Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth System, 12, e2019MS002010,*  
740 *doi:10.1029/2019MS002010*

741 *Bopp L., M. Levy, L. Resplandy, and J. B. Sallée (2015), Pathways of anthropogenic carbon*  
742 *subduction in the global ocean, Geophys. Res. Lett., 42, 6416-6423,*  
743 *doi:10.1002/2015GL065073.*

744 Dong Y., D. C. E. Bakker, T. G. Bell, B. Huang, P. Landschützer, P. Liss, and M. Yang, 2022:  
745 Update on the temperature corrections of global air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> flux estimate, *Global*  
746 *Biogeochemical Cycles*, 36, e2022GB007360, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022GB007360>.

747 Dong, Y., Yang, M., Bakker, D. C. E., Liss, P. S., Kitidis, V., Brown, I., Chierici, M., Fransson,  
748 A., & Bell, T. G. (2021). Near-Surface Stratification Due to Ice Melt Biases Arctic Air-Sea CO<sub>2</sub>  
749 Flux Estimates. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48(22), 1–10.  
750 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL095266>

751 Donlon, C. J., P. J. Minnett, C. Gentemann, T. J. Nightingale, I. J. Barton, B. Ward, and M. J.  
752 Murray (2002), Toward improved validation of satellite sea surface skin temperature  
753 measurements for climate research, *J. Clim.*, 15(4), 353–369.

754 Drushka, K., Asher, W. E., Ward, B., & Walesby, K. (2016). Understanding the formation  
755 and evolution of rain-formed fresh lenses at the ocean surface. *Journal of Geophysical*  
756 *Research: Oceans*, 121, 2673–2689. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JC011527>

757 Fairall, C. W., Bradley, E. F., Godfrey, J. S., Wick, G. A., Edson, J. B., & Young, G. S. (1996).  
758 Cool-skin and warm-layer effects on sea surface temperature. *Journal of Geophysical Research*,  
759 101(C1), 1295–1308. <https://doi.org/10.1029/95JC03190>

760 Fairall C. W., J. E. Hare, J. B. Edson, and W. McGillis, 2000: Parameterization and  
761 micrometeorological measurement of air-sea gas transfer, *Boundary Layer Met.* 96, 63-105.

762 Fay, A. R., Gregor, L., Landschützer, P., McKinley, G. A., Gruber, N., Gehlen, M., Iida, Y.,  
763 Laruelle, G. G., Rödenbeck, C., Roobaert, A., and Zeng, J.: SeaFlux: harmonization of air–sea  
764 CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes from surface pCO<sub>2</sub> data products using a standardized approach, *Earth System*  
765 *Science Data*, 13, 4693–4710, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-13-4693-2021>, 2021.

766 Friedlingstein, P., Jones, M. W., O'Sullivan, M., Andrew, R. M., Bakker, D. C. E., Hauck, J.,  
767 et al., 2022: Global Carbon Budget 2021 *Earth System Science Data*, 14(4), 1917-2005.  
768 <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-1917-2022>.

769 Garbe, C. S., U. Schimpf, B. Jähne, 2004: A surface renewal model to analyse infrared  
770 image sequences of the ocean surface for the study of air-sea heat and gas exchange, *J.*  
771 *Geophys. Res.*, 109, C08S15, doi:10.1029/2003JC001802.

772 Gruber, N. et al. The oceanic sink for anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> from 1994 to 2007. *Science* 363,  
773 1193–1199 (2019).

774 Hare J. E., C. W. Fairall, W. R. McGillis, J. B. Edson, B. Ward, and R. Wanninkhof, 2004:  
775 *Evaluation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/Coupled-Ocean*  
776 *Atmospheric Response Experiment (NOAA/COARE) air-sea gas transfer parameterization*  
777 *using GasEx data*, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, C08S11, doi:10.1029/2003JC001831.

778 Hersbach, H., Bell, B., Berrisford, P., Hirahara, S., Horányi, A., Muñoz-Sabater, J., et al.  
779 (2020). The ERA5 global reanalysis. *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*,  
780 146(730), 1999–2049. <https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3803>

781 Ho D. T., L. F. Bliven, R. Wanninkhof, and P. Schlosser, 1997: The effect of rain on air-water  
782 gas exchange, *Tellus*, 49(2)149-158. <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusb.v49i2.15957>

783 Ho D. T., C. S. Law, M. J. Smith, P. Schlosser, M. Harvey and P. Hill, 2006: Measurements of  
784 air-sea gas exchange at high wind speeds in the Southern Ocean: Implications for global  
785 parameterization, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 33, L16611, doi:10.1029/2006GL026817

786 Ho D. T., and J. J. Schanze, 2020: Precipitation-induced reduction in surface ocean pCO<sub>2</sub>:  
787 Observations from the eastern Tropical Pacific Ocean, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 47, e2020GL088252,  
788 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL088252>

789 Hourdin, F., Rio, C., Grandpeix, J.-Y., Madeleine, J.-B., Cheruy, F., Rochetin, N., and  
790 coauthors (2019). LMDZ6: the improved atmospheric component of the IPSL coupled model. *J.*  
791 *Adv. Modeling Earth Systems* doi:2019MS001988

792 Katsaros, K., and K. J. K. Buettner (1969), Influence of rainfall on temperature and salinity  
793 of the ocean surface, *J. Appl. Meteorol.*, 8, 15–18.

794 Kawai, Y. and A. Wada, 2007: Diurnal sea surface temperature variation and its impact on  
795 the atmosphere and ocean: A review. *J. Oceanogr.*, 63, 721–744.

796 Lengaigne, M., Madec, G., Bopp, L., Menkes, C., Aumont, O., & Cadule, P. (2009). Bio-  
797 physical feedbacks in the Arctic Ocean using an Earth System model. *Geo- phys. Res. Lett.*, 36,  
798 L21602. doi: 10.1029/2009GL040145

799 Liss P. S., and P. G. Slater, 1974: Flux of gases across the air-sea interface, *Nature*, 274,  
800 181-184.

801 Luo, B. and P. J. Minnett, 2020: Evaluation of the ERA5 Sea Surface Skin Temperature with  
802 remotely sensed shipborne marine atmospheric emitted radiance interferometer data, *Remote*  
803 *Sens.*, 12, 1873, doi:10.3390/rs12111873.

804 Madec, G., Bourdalle-Badie, R., Bouttier, P., Bricaud, C., Bruciaferri, D., Calvert, D., and  
805 Vancoppenolle, M. (2017) : NEMO ocean engine (version v3.6). Notes du Pôle de modelisation  
806 de l'Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace (IPSL) . doi :10.5281/zenodo.1472492

807 Merchant, C. J., Embury, O., Bulgin, C. E., Block, T., Corlett, G. K., Fiedler, E., et al. (2019).  
808 Satellite-based time-series of sea-surface temperature since 1981 for climate applications.  
809 *Scientific Data*, 6(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-019-0236-x>

810 Miller, L. A., Burgers, T. M., Burt, W. J., Granskog, M. A., & Papakyriakou, T. N. (2019). Air-  
811 Sea CO<sub>2</sub> Flux Estimates in Stratified Arctic Coastal Waters: How Wrong Can We Be?  
812 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46(1), 235–243. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GL080099>

813 Moulin, A. J., Moum, J. N., Shroyer, E. L., & Hoecker-Martinez, M. (2021). Freshwater lens  
814 fronts propagating as buoyant gravity currents in the equatorial Indian Ocean. *Journal of*  
815 *Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 126, e2021JC017186. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021JC017186>

816 McGillis, W. R., and R. Wanninkhof (2006), Aqueous CO<sub>2</sub> gradients for air-sea flux estimates,  
817 *Mar. Chem.*, 98, 100–108, doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2005.09.003.

818 Olivier, L., J. Boutin, G. Reverdin, N. Lefèvre, P. Landschützer, S. Speich, J. Karstensen, M.  
819 Labaste, C. Noisel, M. Ritschel, T. Steinhoff, and R. Wanninkhof, 2022: Wintertime process  
820 study of the North Brazil Current rings reveals the region as a larger sink for CO<sub>2</sub> than expected,  
821 *Biogeosciences*, 19, 2969-2988, <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-19-2969-2022>

822 Orr, J. C. and Epitalon, J.-M.: Improved routines to model the ocean carbonate system:  
823 *mocsy 2.0*, *Geosci. Model Dev.*, 8, 485–499, doi:10.5194/gmd-8-485-2015, 2015.

824 Regnier, P., Resplandy, L., Najjar, R. G., and Ciais, P.: The land-to-ocean loops of the global  
825 carbon cycle, *Nature*, 603, 401–410, <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-04339-9>, 2022.

826 Reverdin G., A. Supply, K. Drushka, E. J. Thompson, W. E. Asher, and A. Lourenço, 2020,  
827 Intense and small freshwater pools from rainfall investigated during SPURS-2 on 9 November  
828 2017 in the Eastern Tropical Pacific, *J. Geophys. Res.: Oceans*, 125, e2019JC015558. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015558)  
829 [doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015558](https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015558)

830 Reverdin, G., Morisset, S., Boutin, J., & Martin, N. (2012). Rain-induced variability of near  
831 sea-surface T and S from drifter data. *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 117(C2), C02032.  
832 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JC007549>

833 Robertson, J. E. & Watson, A. J. Thermal skin effect of the surface ocean and its implications  
834 for CO<sub>2</sub> uptake. *Nature* 358, 738–740 (1992).

835 Sarmiento, J. L., and N. Gruber (2006), *Ocean Biogeochemical Dynamics*, vol. xiii, 503 pp.,  
836 Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N. J.

837        *Saunders, P. M. (1967), The temperature at the ocean–air interface, J. Atmos. Sci., 24, 269–*  
838 *273.*

839        *Schlüssel, P., A. V. Soloviev, and W. J. Emery (1997), Cool and freshwater skin of the ocean*  
840 *during rainfall, Boundary Layer Meteorol., 82, 437–472.*

841        *Shutler JD, Wanninkhof R, Nightingale PD, Woolf DK, Bakker DCE, Watson A, Ashton I,*  
842  *Holding T, Chapron B, Quilfen Y, et al (2020). Satellites will address critical science priorities for*  
843 *quantifying ocean carbon. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 18(1), 27-35*

844        *Soloviev, A., and R. Lukas (2014), The Near-Surface Layer of the Ocean: Structure, Dynamics*  
845 *and Applications, 572 pp, Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands. DOI 10.1007/978-94-007-7621-0*

846        *Stommel, H., K. Saunders, W. Simmons and J. Cooper, 1969: Observations of the diurnal*  
847 *thermocline. Deep-Sea Res., 16(suppl.), 269-284.*

848        *Stuart-Menteth, A. C., I. S. Robinson, and P. G. Challenor, 2003:A global study of diurnal*  
849 *warming using satellite-derived sea surface temperature. J. Geophys. Res., 108, 3155,*  
850 *doi:10.1029/2002JC001534.*

851        *Supply A., Boutin J., Reverdin G., Vergely JL., Bellenger H. (2020) Variability of Satellite Sea*  
852 *Surface Salinity Under Rainfall. In: Levizzani V., Kidd C., Kirschbaum D., Kummerow C.,*  
853 *Nakamura K., Turk F. (eds) Satellite Precipitation Measurement. Advances in Global Change*  
854 *Research, vol 69. Springer, Cham. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35798-6\\_34](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35798-6_34)*

855        *Takahashi, T., Sutherland, S. C., Wanninkhof, R., Sweeney, C., Feely, R. A., Chipman, D. W.,*  
856 *et al. (2009). Climatological mean and decadal change in surface ocean pCO<sub>2</sub>, and net sea-air*  
857 *CO<sub>2</sub> flux over the global oceans. Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography,*  
858 *56(8–10), 554–577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.DSR2.2008.12.009>*

859 Ten Doeschate, A., G. Sutherland, H. Bellenger, S. Landwehr, L. Esters, et al. Upper Ocean  
860 Response to Rain Observed from a Vertical Profiler. *Journal of Geophysical Research. Oceans*,  
861 Wiley-Blackwell, 2019, 124 (6), pp.3664-3681.

862 Turk, D., C. J. Zappa, C. S. Meinen, J. R. Christian, D. T. Ho, A. G. Dickson, and W. R. McGillis,  
863 2010: Rain impacts on CO<sub>2</sub> exchange in the western equatorial Pacific Ocean, *Geophys. Res.*  
864 *Lett.*, 37, L23610.

865 Van Scoy, K. A., K. P. Morris, J. E. Robertson, and A. J. Watson (1995), Thermal skin effect  
866 and the air-sea flux of carbon dioxide: A seasonal high-resolution estimate, *Global Biogeochem.*  
867 *Cycles*, 9, 253–262, doi:10.1029/94GB03356.

868 Walker Brown C., J. Boutin, and L. Merlivat, 2015: New insights into fCO<sub>2</sub> variability in the  
869 tropical eastern Pacific Ocean using SMOS SSS, *Biogeosciences*, 12, 7315-7329.

870 Wanninkhof, R. (2014). Relationship between wind speed and gas exchange over the ocean  
871 revisited. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, 12(6), 351–362.  
872 <https://doi.org/10.4319/lom.2014.12.351>

873 Wanninkhof, R., Asher, W. E., Ho, D. T., Sweeney, C., & McGillis, W. R. (2009). Advances in  
874 quantifying air-sea gas exchange and environmental forcing. *Annual Review of Marine Science*,  
875 1(1), 213–244. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.marine.010908.163742>

876 Watson A. J., U. Schuster, J. D. Shutler, T. Holding, I. G. C. Ashton, P. Landschützer, D. K.  
877 Woolf, and L. Goddijn-Murphy, 2020: Revised estimates of ocean-atmosphere CO<sub>2</sub> flux are  
878 consistent with carbon inventory, *Nature Comm.*, 11:4422, [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18203-3)  
879 [020-18203-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18203-3).

880 Ward, B., R. Wanninkhof, W. R. McGillis, A. T. Jessup, M. D. DeGrandpre, J. E. Hare, and J.  
881 B. Edson (2004), Biases in the air-sea flux of CO<sub>2</sub> resulting from ocean surface temperature  
882 gradients, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109, C08S08, doi:10.1029/2003JC001800

883 Weiss R. F. 1974: *Carbon dioxide in water and seawater: The solubility of a non-ideal gas.*  
884 *Marine Chemistry*, 2(3), 203-215. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4203\(74\)90015-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4203(74)90015-2)

885 Woods, S., P. J. Minnett, C. L. Gentemann, and D. Bogucki (2014), *Influence of the oceanic*  
886 *cool skin layer on global air–sea CO<sub>2</sub> flux estimates*, *Remote Sens. Environ.*, 145, 15–24,  
887 [doi:10.1016/j.rse.2013.11.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2013.11.023).

888 Woolf, D. K., Shutler, J. D., Goddijn- Murphy, L., Watson, A. J., Chapron, B., Nightingale, P.  
889 D., et al. (2019). *Key uncertainties in the recent air-sea flux of CO<sub>2</sub>*. *Global Biogeochemical*  
890 *Cycles*, 33, 1548–1563. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018GB006041>.

891 Woolf, D. K., P. E. Land, J. D. Shutler, L. M. Goddijn-Murphy, and C. J. Donlon, 2016: *On the*  
892 *calculation of air-sea fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub> in the presence of temperature and salinity gradients*, *J.*  
893 *Geophys. Res. Oceans*, 121, 1229-1248.

894 Yang, M., Bell, T. G., Bidlot, J. R., Blomquist, B. W., Butterworth, B. J., Dong, Y., Fairall, C.  
895 W., Landwehr, S., Marandino, C. A., Miller, S. D., Saltzman, E. S., & Zavarisky, A. (2022). *Global*  
896 *Synthesis of Air-Sea CO<sub>2</sub> Transfer Velocity Estimates from Ship-Based Eddy Covariance*  
897 *Measurements. Frontiers in Marine Science*, 9(June), 1–15.  
898 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2022.826421>

899 Yu, L. (2010), *On sea surface salinity skin effect induced by evaporation and implications*  
900 *for remote sensing of ocean salinity*, *J. Phys. Oceanogr.*, 40, 85–102,  
901 [doi:10.1175/2009JPO4168.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JPO4168.1).

902 Zeng X., and A. Beljaars, 2005: *A prognostic scheme of sea surface skin temperature for*  
903 *modeling and data assimilation*, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L14605.


904 Zhang, X., and W.-J. Cai (2007), *On some biases of estimating the global distribution of air-*  
905 *sea CO<sub>2</sub> flux by bulk parameterization*, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 34, L01608,  
906 [doi:10.1029/2006GL027337](https://doi.org/10.1029/2006GL027337)

- 907        *Zhang, Y., and X. Zhang (2012), Ocean haline skin layer and turbulent surface convections,*  
908   *J. Geophys. Res., 117, C04017, doi:10.1029/s2011JC007464*

909 **Table 1.** This table gathers information on the two simulations (DIAG and CPL) that are  
910 presented in this study and the details of the different CO<sub>2</sub> prognostic fluxes used interactively  
911 to compute the carbon cycle in the model. The other fluxes are only diagnostic. Temperature  
912 and salinity that are used to compute the different terms of the CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes are reported. The  
913 subscripts correspond to the level at which the temperature and salinity are considered (see  
914 figure 1a). The table also provides the mean 2000-2014 annual global carbon sink (PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>)  
915 for the different fluxes and the difference compared to the basic flux *F*. Corresponding year-  
916 to-year standard deviations are provided in parenthesis (no detrending applied). *The last two*  
917 *lines recalls the recent observation-based estimates of the skin effect by Watson et al. (2020)*  
918 *and Dong et al. (2022).*  
919

Simulation	CO <sub>2</sub> fluxes	Rapid (Rap.) or Equilibrium (Eq.) Model	$[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_i = K_{0p} \text{CO}_2^{\text{atm}}$	$[\text{CO}_{2\text{aq}}]_w$	Global CO <sub>2</sub> sink (PgC yr <sup>-1</sup> )	CO <sub>2</sub> sink increase (PgC yr <sup>-1</sup> )
DIAG	<i>F</i> (prognostic)	-	$T_{h/2}, S_{h/2}$	$T_{h/2}, S_{h/2}$	+2.04 (0.09)	-
	<i>F</i> <sub>MBL</sub> (diagnostic)	Eq. Model	$T_{int}, S_{int}$	$T_{MBL}, S_{MBL}$	+2.42 (0.09)	+0.37 (7.10 <sup>-3</sup> )
	<i>F</i> <sub>TBL</sub> (diagnostic)	Rap. Model	$T_{int}, S_{int}$	$T_{TBL}, S_{TBL} = S_{MBL}$	+2.31 (0.09)	+0.26 (5.10 <sup>-3</sup> )
	<i>F</i> <sub>Wat</sub> (diagnostic)	Rap. Model	$T_{h/2}-0.17, S_{h/2}+0.1$	$T_{h/2}, S_{h/2}$	+2.38 (0.1)	+0.33 (8.10 <sup>-3</sup> )
	<i>F</i> <sub>skinM</sub> (diagnostic)	Eq. Model	$T_{h/2} + T_{int} - T_{TBL}, S_{h/2} + S_{int} - S_{MBL}$	$T_{h/2} + T_{MBL} - T_{TBL}, S_{h/2}$	+2.44 (0.09)	+0.39 (8.10 <sup>-3</sup> )
	<i>F</i> <sub>skinT</sub> (diagnostic)	Rap. Model	$T_{h/2} + T_{int} - T_{TBL}, S_{h/2} + S_{int} - S_{MBL}$	$T_{h/2}, S_{h/2}$	+2.33 (0.09)	+0.28 (5.10 <sup>-3</sup> )
	<i>F</i> <sub>noS</sub> (diagnostic)	Eq. Model	$T_{int}, S_{MBL}$	$T_{MBL}, S_{MBL}$	+2.44 (0.09)	+0.39 (8.10 <sup>-3</sup> )
CPL	<i>F</i> <sub>MBL</sub> (prognostic)	Rap. Model	$T_{int}, S_{int}$	$T_{MBL}, S_{MBL}$	+2.18 (0.1)	+0.13 (0.09)
Observation-based estimate <i>Watson et al. (2020)</i> for 1992-2018						+0.4 (0.04)
Observation-based estimate <i>Dong et al. (2022)</i> for 1982-2020						+0.39 (0.08)


920



921  
922

923 **Figure 1.** Schematic of (a) temperature (red) and salinity (blue) profiles below the ocean-  
 924 atmosphere interface and within the first level of the ocean model of depth  $h=1\text{m}$  (central  
 925 depth  $h/2=0.5\text{m}$ ) for a typical daylight situation and (b) water  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration profile  
 926 ( $[CO_{2aq}]_w$ , orange) and interfacial  $\text{CO}_2$  concentrations ( $[CO_{2aq}]_i$ , green) corresponding to T and  
 927 S taken at different depth from (a). Starting from the ocean interface, there is an increase in  
 928 temperature with increasing depth down to the base of the Thermal Boundary Layer (TBL).  
 929 This is the ocean's "cool skin". Then the temperature decreases with depth within the first  
 930 meter due to a warm layer formation (in this case, the diurnal warming is less than the cool

931 skin effect). There is a decrease with increasing depth for salinity, mostly within the Mass  
932 Boundary Layer (MBL) due to surface evaporation at the interface. The characteristics of the  
933 TBL and the MBL reflect the characteristics of molecular diffusion. Because species or mass  
934 diffusion is weaker than heat diffusion, the TBL is thicker than the MBL. The TBL is typically  
935 0.5-1 mm thick and the MBL is typically  $1/10^{\text{th}}$  of the TBL ( $1/5^{\text{th}}$  in our simulation). A linear  
936 profile in temperature is assumed in the TBL to deduce  $T_{MBL}$  (see text for details). Dashed  
937 profiles represent the constant corrections that are applied to  $T_{h/2}$  and  $S_{h/2}$  to obtain  $T_{Wat}$  and  
938  $S_{Wat}$  following Watson et al. (2020). Color arrows in (b) represent a subset of  $\text{CO}_2$  fluxes from  
939 table 1 corresponding to T and S profiles from (a).  $[\text{CO}_{2aq}]_i$  is mainly a decreasing function of  $T$   
940 whereas  $[\text{CO}_{2aq}]_w$  is an increasing function of  $T$  and  $S$  (see Annex). The black arrow represents  
941 the classical bulk flux ( $F$ ), the red arrow represents the flux computed using the “equilibrium  
942 model” assumption ( $F_{MBL}$ ), the blue arrows represent the flux using the “rapid model”  
943 assumption with an interactive ocean skin ( $F_{TBL}$ , blue) or a uniform one ( $F_{Wat}$ , light blue).  
944




945  
 946 **Figure 2.** Maps of mean air-sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes between 2000-2014 (positive into the ocean, colors)  
 947 from (a) the  $F^{DIAG}$  flux from the DIAG simulation with IPSL-CM6 and (b) SeaFlux data product  
 948 average for the 6 interpolation methods for the pCO<sub>2</sub> maps and 5 wind products presented in  
 949 Fay et al. (2021) and (c) the difference between IPSL-CM6 and SeaFlux product (only difference  
 950 significant to the 99% level are plotted). (d) Time series of the global annual CO<sub>2</sub> sink (PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>)  
 951 from the Global Carbon Budget (Friedlingstein et al. 2022) based on data products (dashed  
 952 green, standard deviation shaded), models and data products (dashed black, standard  
 953 deviation shaded) and computed from  $F^{DIAG}$  (thin black),  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  (thin red),  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  (thin blue)  
 954 and  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  (thin light blue) IPSL-CM6 reference simulation (DIAG) and  $F_{MBL}^{CPL}$  (thin dashed  
 955 black) from the coupled (CPL) simulation.

956

957

958



960


961 **Figure 3.** Probability distributions of (a) the temperature differences between the interface962 and the base of the Thermal Boundary Layer  $T_{Int} - T_{TBL}$  (TBL, black) and the base of the TBL and963  $d=3m$  depth  $T_{TBL} - T_{3m}$  (red) and (b) likewise for salinity  $S_{Int} - S_{MBL}$  (black) and  $S_{MBL} - S_{3m}$  (red).

964 Solid lines are from the 15 years DIAG simulation with IPSL-CM6 and dashed lines are from

965 Bellenger et al. (2017) forced by 18 years of 1-hour ERA5 data.

966






976

977 **Figure 5.** (a) Mean 2000-2014 global ocean carbon sink (PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>, left axis) from DIAG  
 978 simulation computed with  $F^{DIAG}$  (black bar),  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  (red bar),  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  (blue bar) and  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$   
 979 (light blue bar) and corresponding mean differences in global carbon sink with the one  
 980 computed with  $F^{DIAG}$  (PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>, right axis). Whiskers represent the year-to-year standard  
 981 deviations (no detrending applied). (b) Time series of the annual global ocean CO<sub>2</sub> sink  
 982 differences between  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG}$  (red),  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG}$  (blue) and  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG}$  (light blue) and  $F^{DIAG}$  from DIAG  
 983 simulation (Pg yr<sup>-1</sup>, shading are the intra-annual standard deviation of the corresponding  
 984 differences) and (c) monthly mean seasonal cycle of the northern (dashed) and southern


985 (dotted) hemisphere CO<sub>2</sub> sink differences (Pg yr<sup>-1</sup>, colors are as in (b), shading represents the  
986 day-to-day standard deviation for each month).

987

988



989  
 990 **Figure 6.** Mean maps for 15 years of DIAG simulation of (a)  $F^{DIAG}$  ( $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ) and (b) the  
 991  $F_{MBL}^{DIAG} - F^{DIAG}$  difference ( $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ), (c) the  $F_{TBL}^{DIAG} - F^{DIAG}$  difference ( $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ) and (d)  
 992 the  $F_{Wat}^{DIAG} - F_{blk}^{DIAG}$  difference ( $\text{g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ). Only differences significant to the 99% level  
 993 with the student t-test are plotted.




994


995 **Figure 7.** As Figure 5 but for December-January-February (a, c, e and g) and June-July-August

996 (b, d, f and h). Only differences significant to the 99% level with the student t-test are plotted.

997



998  
 999 **Figure 8.** (a) Mean global carbon sink (PgC yr<sup>-1</sup>) from DIAG and CPL simulations computed with  
 1000  $F^{DIAG}$  (black bar, left axis) and  $F_{MBL}^{CPL}$  (purple bar, left axis), respectively; the difference is  
 1001 plotted in orange (right axis). Whiskers represent the year-to-year standard deviation.  $F_{MBL}^{CPL}$   
 1002  $- F^{DIAG}$  is significantly different from zero at the 99% level. (b) The zonal and 15-year mean  
 1003 difference between  $F_{MBL}^{CPL}$  and  $F^{DIAG}$  (g C m<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>, left axis) and the difference between the  
 1004 ocean model's first level pCO<sub>2</sub> between CPL and DIAG simulations (µatm, red, right axis).  
 1005 Shadings represent the year-to-year variability. Lines are bold where the difference is  
 1006 significantly different from zero at the 99% level.  
 1007



1008

1009 **Figure 9.** (a) Mean cool skin effect as a function of 10m wind speed ( $T_{\text{int}} - T_{\text{TBL}} = \Delta T_{\text{TBL}}(W10m)$ ,  
 1010 red solid line) from IPSL-CM6 and associated standard deviation (red shading) and 10m wind  
 1011 speed distribution per 0.1 m/s bin (black line). (b) 15-year mean difference (colors in K)  
 1012 between the cool skin effect from IPSL-CM6 and the cool skin effect computed from the mean  
 1013 relationship plotted in (a). The difference between the cool skins is computed using 90 min-  
 1014 model outputs and averaged over time.