

Interactive comment on “One hundred years of atmospheric and marine observations at Utö Island, the Baltic Sea” by Lauri Laakso et al.

I. Vuorinen (Referee)

ilppovuo@utu.fi

Received and published: 3 May 2018

General comments:

The paper presents first time digitized and quality assured oceanographic data from the Northern Baltic proper in (semi) open sea conditions. Temporal range of the data is impressive, starting in 1881. Spatially the data is from one spot, which lies somewhat mid-way between open sea and coastal conditions, also between the Bay of Bothnia and the Gulf of Finland. Approach and methods are basic, which is okay for this type of paper (presentation of a new, significant data set). The discussion could be somewhat more extensive (see below in specific comments).

Presentation of figures and tables is appropriate (with some exceptions which are com-

C1

mented below), and English is mostly okay. I suggest below some places where wording should be reconsidered.

I suggest publication with minor corrections.

Specific comments

Title: One hundred years of atmospheric and marine observations at Utö Island, the Baltic Sea. -There are several islands with that name in the Baltic. I know of one in Sweden and two in Finland. Consider adding the coordinates, the country, or other information in the title in order to avoid mixing at least with the Utö in the Stockholm archipelago.

Abstract: I like the last sentence. It points out a possible tipping into a new phase. This idea should be discussed more thoroughly, considering a possible breakpoint, its temporal location and affecting mechanisms. I agree, that would be obligatorily speculative, but as at present this idea seems to be the only one outcome suggested by authors, it would be important to ponder it more deeply. I miss other conclusive sentences, such as what would be the best, or more appropriate way (instead of just assuming a linear model) to analyze the evidently non-linear change over time which is seen in many parameters, such as in the salinity. I agree that the linear analysis should be the one to start with, but I also expect the authors to show capability to go further. Seeing abrupt changes like temperature since the 1980s and salinity at Utö makes me look for possible explanations and coincidences. You could suggest a way forward, and the use of e.g. breakpoint equations in coming analyses, with other, non-linear, models.

Page 2 lines 10-12, you aim the paper to “analyse these time series in order to get information on typical atmospheric and marine conditions”, but reading the paper makes me think that several less typical phenomena are shown, such as a rapid increase of salinity, or a decrease and disappearance of the ice cover and a subsequent suggestion of a shift of balance in the climate of Utö into a new phase. So I suggest rewording these

C2

lines, for the reader not expect too much of “just typical” happenings being observed.

Line 31, you give the coordinates and write about the observation site and about the Island. Are these coordinates for the midpoint of the Island or the lighthouse or coordinates for atmospheric observations? Compare to page 4, line 33, where you give coordinates for the oceanographic sampling point.

Page 3, the map should have two panels, one showing the location in the Baltic sea (the present one) and another to show local bottom topography, depth etc.

Page 4, line 1, “with permanent pilots living on the island for generations” this is repetition of the information of the first part of the sentence, and, besides, “pilots living for generations” sounds improbable. Remove the sentence.

Line 5, you write that: especially the deep samples may be considered to represent conditions of the Baltic Proper. On the other hand you write (page 9, line 1-2): we do not see any permanent halocline (and comment that possible cause to the halocline missing could be mixing due to currents.) These two statements are contradictory, first one is by Ahlnäs in 1961. Have the circumstances changed between then and now? Lack of the deep halocline also puts the sampling station oceanographically more to the Bothnian Bay side than on the Northern Baltic Sea. Could you comment on that? Line 7. I do not accept the phrase about biological characteristics. First: there is no information included in writing that “biological characteristics are typical for the outer archipelago” as this is anyway the basic assumption. Secondly, this kind of basic assumption is not valid for this location as biological characteristics point out to a eutrophic environment. Since the 1980's the cyanobacterial blooms have been observed in this area, but before that the area, as the whole Northern Baltic Proper was considered to be an oligotrophic environment. Same rapid change from oligotrophy to eutrophy is seen in, for example, in Secchi disc readings in the Gulf of Finland during the 1900. Please give appropriate information on biological change over at least the last decades, as you do for the sea ice in the next sentence.

C3

Page 6, lines 32-33, you write that you investigated the annual average temperatures against the NAO indices in Fig 3., but that figure only shows the NAO history, while temperatures are given in the Fig. 2. You also claim finding, for individual years, lower temperatures connected to highest negative NAO values, but in Fig. 2 there are no temperature values given for individual years at all. You refer also to Fig. 2 having lowest temperature values (5 year periods) in around 1980, while this period (1980) in the NAO figures just show mid values of the index. What are “highest negative NAO values” anyway? Are they just lowest values of the index, or something else? Rewrite this part. Page 7, line 9 and 12, you write about manual observations, you should write about visual observations.

Page 8, line 3, you mention not to have found significant changes in wind speed. Okay, but my personal observation from Utö station when comparing wind observations before and after the 1970s was that there was a substantial reduction of completely calm days (see attached figure which is based in Finnish Meteorological Institute observations at the Island of Utö)). So the overall windiness has increased anyway. As you suggest, more analyses are needed. You could try and include also the data on calm days.

Page 9, line 4-5, remove the sentence: “As our focus is..” and start directly from: “We decided to..” Lines 14-15 you write that: “the surface temperature follows the...atmospheric temperatures Fig. 2) ...with a rapid increase in 1980s, which is okay and correct, but then you write that: “and a warmer period from 1930 until 1960s” which, however is not seen at all in the Fig 2 which you refer to. Rewrite that part.

Page 13, line 10, “reduces the lowest temperatures” sounds strange. Consider rewording.

Typos: page 9, line 4 reads: one hundred year, should read one hundred years.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

C4

<https://www.ocean-sci-discuss.net/os-2017-105/os-2017-105-RC2-supplement.zip>

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-2017-105>, 2018.