



Supplement of

Assessment of the representation of Antarctic Bottom Water properties in the ECCO2 reanalysis

M. Azaneu et al.

Correspondence to: M. Azaneu (m.azaneu@furg.br)

21	Table S1:	Sampling p	periods from	i the historical	WOCE section	s used in the study.
----	-----------	------------	--------------	------------------	--------------	----------------------

	Historical WOCE Sections					
	SR4	SR3	SR2			
	11/1992	03/1993	06/1992			
	12/1992 - 01/1993	01/1994	04/1996			
oling	04/1996 - 05/1996	03/1996	04/1998 - 005/1998			
Sam	04/1998	11/2001 – 12/2001	03/1999			
ar of	02/2005 - 03/2005	01/2002 - 02/2002	12/2000			
th/Ye	03/2008	02/2003 - 03/2003	12/2002			
Mon	12/2010 - 01/2011		02/2005			
			02/2008 - 03/2008			
			12/2010			











Figure S1: Difference between the reanalysis and observed average fields (1992–2004) of θ (left panel) and S (right panel) for the (a) surface layer – SL, (b) intermediate layer – IL and (c) bottom layer – BL.



29

30 Figure S2: Difference between the reanalysis and observed average fields of θ (left panel) and S (right panel) for the repeat

31 (a) section WOCE SR3, (b) section WOCE SR4 and (c) section WOCE SR2. A more detailed description of the differences in the

 θ and S fields for sections WOCE SR2 and WOCE SR4 can be found in Dotto et al. (2013).

33



Figure S3: Section I (see Figure 1) averaged velocity field (cm s⁻¹) for February 2003 – January 2005 as evaluated by
Fukamachi et al. (2010). White dotted lines indicate isotherms.



40 Figure S4: Hovmöller diagram of the average temperature in Section IV (see Fig. 1).