Dear Editor,

We thank the two reviewers for their critical and constructive comments on our research. Their comments have significantly improved our manuscript. The main modifications in the revision are las follows:

- **Use the new version of the BEC SSS to replace the previously used in this study.**
- **Extend the SSS from 5 m to 8 m near the surface when extracted from in-situ data, in order to involve the ITP observations.**
- **Rearrange the orders in Section 3 and Section 4 to highlight the evaluation against in-situ data, and which has been divided into two parts referred to dependent and independent in-situ dataset in the Sec. 4.**
- **All figures have been updated due to the above two changes and two scatterplots showing the SSS against in-situ data from CORA5.1 are complemented in the revision.**
- **We have improved the English and expanded/shortened the text as recommended by the reviewers.**

Below are the detailed responses to their comments: the reviewer comments are in black oud our response is in red.

Anonymous Referee #1

The paper shows an intercomparison among 6 arctic salinity products (2 based on SMOS acquisitions, 2 climatologies and 2 reanalysis products). All products are also compared with in-situ data CORA 5.1. In addition to the intercomparison by itself, the aim of the paper is to evaluate the best SMOS product to be assimilated by TOPAZ4 reanalysis product.

-A: We thank the referee for the detailed evaluation of our manuscript and constructive suggestions. We appreciated this very much, all the comments are taken into account in the revised version.

General Comments

The paper needs a general improvement of the writing. In some cases the concepts are no clear and English should be improved.

-A: We thank the reviewer for pointing out this weakness in the manuscript. We have improved the English, in addition to extending, shortening and rearranging the text for improved clarity.

Other general comment refers to the version of the BEC SMOS product included in the comparison. The version of the SMOS BEC product is only clearly defined at the end of the conclusions (lines 543-546). This should be explained in section 2. According to the expressed in conclusions, the version of the BEC SMOS product used in this paper is version 1.0. This version is not accessible now because it has been superseded by version 2.0. Why authors have not included v2.0 instead v1.0 in this study?

-A: Thank you for this comment, we agree with the reviewer. Note that BEC product was released just before the submission of this manuscript. The SMOS BEC product used has been replaced by the version of 2.0, which is also defined in Section 2.1. We update all figures and results in the revised manuscript.

This reviewer knows the effort that implies to redo this validation using the new BEC product, but taking into account that v1.0 is not available, the inclusion of this product in the study is not interesting and v2.0 should be used. It is not necessary to proceed with all the period of the current v2.0, only the studied period (2011-2013) will be enough. Please, use v2.0 of 2011-2013 period instead v1.0. Change "BEC product" section accordingly.

-A: Agreed. The revision will replace the previous BEC product with version 2.0 and the concerned figures and analysis are updated.

Specific Comments

Lines 142-145: The BEC Arctic product 1.0 is not created as is described here. Systematic bias of the retrieved salinity data is corrected computing the so-called SMOS climatology (the most probable value for a given lat-lon, incidence angle and across swath distance) and substituting this one by a reference. The used reference is the annual WOA13 (the same reference for all maps) and not Argo float extrapolated at 7.5km. The second correction (the temporal bias correction) was computed for version 1.0 of the Arctic product in the same way as in the global one: assuming that the quantity of salt is constant in the surface. This coarse approach has been refined in version 2.0 (the current one) using Argo to compute the mean value of salinity for each Arctic map.

-A: Thank you for this informative and constructive comment, the text is changed to:

Lines 135-143: “The BEC SSS product was generated from ESA L1B (v620) products, and accumulates salinity data over 9 days with a spatial grid resolution of 25 km. With respect to its previous version, a systematic bias in the retrieved salinity is corrected by computing the SMOS climatology (the most probable value for a given lat-lon, incidence angle and across-swath distance) which is substituted by a reference value from WOA13. In addition, a temporal bias correction has been refined in this version using near-surface Argo salinity to compute regional averages (see the details in Olmedo et al., 2018).”

Line 147: The anomaly is referenced to WOA13 (not WOA09)

-A: Thank you. It is corrected.

Section 3: Many comparisons are made involving different regions and products. A table similar to table 1 but for intercomparisons would help to the reader.

-A: It is a good suggestion. A new table (Table 1) is added to clearly explain the product specifications. Moreover, the concerned sections are rearranged, and the evaluations against in-situ data are divide into two part according to dependent and independent observations in Section 4.

Line 466: Beware both SMOS products do not use different BT filtering flags. The main difference between both is that they are applying a completely different salinity retrieval method.

-A: Thanks for this point. It is deleted and replaced by other statement as Line 447: “… due to the different retrieval applied in these two datasets.”

Lines 5-9: Suppress “respectively”. This long sentence probably sounds better as “Recently, two independent gridded SSS products have been derived from …. mission: the developed by the Barcelona… and the one developed by Ocean….” Here a mention about the regional or global character of both products will help to the reader to know about the general characteristics of each product (one can expect that a product specifically developed for Arctic will provide better results)

-A: Thank you for this suggestion. Here is the revised text as

Lines of 2-6: “Recently two gridded Sea Surface Salinity (SSS) products that cover the Arctic Ocean have been derived from the European Space Agency’s (ESA) Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) mission: one developed by the Barcelona Expert Centre (BEC) and the other developed by the Ocean Salinity Expertise Center of the Centre Aval de Traitement des Données SMOS at IFREMER (CEC).”

Line 42: “northern North Atlantic”. Authors are referring to the north of the North Sea (a relative mall region) or the authors are referring to the thermohaline circulation between Arctic Ocean and North Atlantic? (probably is this second option but “northern North Atlantic” sounds strange to me)

-A: Thank you for this comment. This sentence referred to the thermohaline circulation between Arctic Ocean and North Atlantic. And this sentence will be changed as

Lines of 41-43: “The SSS also affects the decadal variability of hydrography in the upper waters of the North Atlantic (Reverdin et al., 1997).”

Lines 47-50. This sentence is difficult to read. “a significant change in the global warming scenario” should be “ or a significant”? Probably no, but I do not clearly understand what is the meaning of this sentence.

-A: This sentence will be corrected by the lines of 46-49:

“Additionally, the increased melting of glaciers and sea-ice in the Arctic (McPhee et al., 1998; Macdonald et al., 1999) leads to significant changes in the salinity distribution and fresh water pathways (Steele and Ermold, 2004; Morison et al., 2012).”

Macdonald, R. W., Carmack, E. C., McLaughlin, F. A., Falkner, K. K., and Swift, J. H.: Connections among ice, runoff and atmospheric forcing in the Beaufort Gyre. Geophys. Res. Lett., 26, 2223–2226, 1999

McPhee, M. G., Stanton, T. P., Morison, J. H. and Martinson, D. G.: Freshening of the upper ocean in the Arctic: is perennial sea ice disappearing? Geophys. Res. Lett. 25, 1729–1732, 1998.

Morison, J., Kwok, R., Peralta-Ferriz, C., Alkire, M., Rigor, I., Andersen, R., and Steele, M.: Changing arctic ocean freshwater pathways. Nature, 481:66–70, 2012.

Steele, M. and W. Ermold (2004) Salinity Trends on the East Siberian Shelves, Geophysical Research Letters, Vol. 31, L24308, doi:10.1029/2004GL021302, 2004.

Line 112: There exist, at least, two different versions of WOA13 (1.0 and 2.0) with significant differences between them in the Arctic data. Please, indicate the one used in this study.

-A: Thanks for this point. It is the WOA13 version 2.0, clearly stated in the revision.

Line 130: "non geophysical sources" should be better than "unphysical contaminations"

-A: Thank you for this suggestion. It is corrected.

Line 131: ice-sea contamination should be mentioned because is an important source of biases in the Arctic.

-A: Thank you for this suggestion. The following statement has been added on 124-127:

"The SSS retrieval from SMOS is subject to biases originating from various non-geophysical sources such as the so-called land-sea contamination and the latitudinal biases, mainly caused by the thermal drift of the instrument. A particular challenge in the Arctic is the sea-ice edge because of ice-ocean contamination."

Line 193: Acronyms EnKF (Ensemble Kalman Filter) and DEnKF have not been defined in the text

-A: It is corrected.

Line 268: "Marches" should be "matches"?

-A: It is corrected.

Lines 281-282: Have in mind that comparison of BEC product and WOA is not recommended because BEC product incorporates as reference WOA13.

-A: Thank you for pointing out this issue. In fact, even if the BEC product has incorporated WOA13as reference, the updated evaluation of the BEC version 2.0 still shows values far from the referred climatology as shown in Fig. A1. In the Barents

Sea, there is a clear salinity bias of BEC even if this product has been referred to WOA13.



Fig. A1 Monthly SSS (unit: psu) in March from satellite products of (a) BEC and (b) CEC, reanalyzes of (b) TP4 and (e) MOB, and climatology of (c) PHC and (f) WOA. The black shaded isoline represents the salinity of 35 psu near surface regarding to the product self.

The statement is changed as the Lines of 251-256:

"In comparison to the March situation, the BEC and CEC SSS in the Nordic Seas are both less saline, indicated by the 35 psu isoline. The sea ice masking of the two SMOS products differ considerably in the Canadian Basin and in the Arctic marginal seas. Although the SSS of TP4, MOB, PHC and WOA agree relatively well in the northern Atlantic Ocean, the discrepancies become dramatic in ice-covered areas."

Lines 285-286: For this reviewer is not clear what do you mean with "over the sea-ice conver" and "under the sea-ice cover"... Under sea-ice cover means "below the ice"? Probably the meanin is related with latitudes not covered by ice?

-A: Thank you for this point. It is corrected as the lines of 256-260:

"Below the ice or near the sea-ice edge (denoted by the brown thick line in Fig. 2 and 3), TP4 and PHC share common features, which can be explained by the model restoring to PHC. On the other hand, the MOB and WOA differ significantly in spite of WOA being used as input to the MOB."

Line 294: This sentence refers to figure 6? This figure is only referred in conclusions (line 487)

-A: No, it refers to Fig. 4 and Fig.6, this has been clarified in the text.

Line 413: The mentioned four observations, are outliers?

-A: Yes, a more detailed explanation had been included on lines 381-385:

"Looking at the low-salinity observations (~27 psu) collected at (136.4°W, 70.5°N) on 15th August 2011, marked by anti-triangles (Fig. 1b) near the Mackenzie River estuary, TP4 has a significant negative bias (< -4 psu) visible as the outliers above the dashed-black line in Fig. 11a. This hints to a lack of fresh water signatures from river discharge."

Line 536: In my opinion this is not a validation. Is a comparison.

-A: Right, 'validation' is changed to 'evaluation'.

Line 61. Typo: MIRIAS should be MIRAS

-A: It is corrected.

Technical corrections (Typos)

Line 122: Typo: "in in Section" ("in" written twice)

-A: It is corrected.

Line 133: Typo: "march-up" should be "match-up"?

-A: Thanks for this point. It is corrected

Line 139: Correct address is http://bec.icm.csic.es

-A: It is corrected.

Line 163: Typo: should be EASE instead of EASA

-A: Here, it means an Equal-Area Scalable Earth Grid (EASE-Grid), and also changed in the revision.

Line 281: Typo: then should be than. The correct ending for the sentence should be "than the provided by BEC product"

-A: Thank you for this point. It is corrected

Line 317: Word SMOS is used twice.

-A: It is corrected.

Line 552: The correct URL is bec.icm.csic.es

-A: Thanks, it is corrected.

Anonymous Referee #2

The paper aims to quantify uncertainties of Arctic observation-based sea surface salinity to be included in the TOPAZ reanalysis. Two SMOS products are considered and compared against climatologies, observed data sets and reanalysis. This is an important problem in advancing in the data assimilation technics and improving the quality of CMEMS reanalyses. Anyway this study is not a significant step along that path. The paper has some unclear or incomplete reasoning. I do not feel that this research is ready to be published in OS. I do encourage resubmission after a much more detailed and careful investigation.

-A: We thank the referee for the time spent and for the detailed revision of our manuscript. We appreciated very much for the comments which are all taken into account in the revised version of the manuscript.

My primary concerns are i) the research is poorly presented, with vital details missing

-A: Thank you for this comment. We have improved the presentation of the work to help the reader understand. This evaluation has two parts: the first part is an intercomparison with reference to the TP4 reanalysis, the second part is an evaluation with respect to two types of in-situ datasets which are involved in the TOPAZ system and independent respectively. In the revision, the observed SSS by in situ near surface will be extended from no deeper than 5 m depth to 8 m depth, which will involve more observation samples for this evaluation.

ii) the BEC SMOS product selected from this study should actually be updated to version 2.

-A: Yes. In the revision, we use the version 2.0 of BEC product to replace all the figure and the concerned analysis (also see the response to the same comment of Referee #1).

iii) the PHC data set is old, is included in WOA13 and assimilated in TOPAZ. It does not add much to the analysis

-A: Thank you for this suggestion. The PHC dataset is one of the most important climatology in the Arctic Ocean, and still implemented widely in quantitative evaluation works (Carton et al., 2018, 2019). The PHC is based on the archive of observations primarily from the 1950s through the 1980s and so may have a somewhat cool climatology. In the current version of TOPAZ, the combined climatology of PHC and WOA13 are used as relaxation so that the quantitative comparison of two climatologies still could be helpful to reasonably reject this or not for the improving of the model relaxation process.

Carton, J.A., G.A. Chepurin, and L. Chen, 2018: SODA3: a new ocean climate reanalysis, *J. Clim.*, **31**, 6967-6983, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0149.1.

Carton, J.A., S.G. Penny, and E. Kalnay, 2019: Temperature and salinity variability in soda3, ECCO4r3, and ORAS5 ocean reanalyses, 1993-2015, *J. Clim.*, 32, 2277-2293, doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0605.1.

iv) MOI is not a reanalysis. The CMEMS product MULTIOBS_GLO_PHY_REP_015_002 is a combination of four data set. I do define a reanalysis as a combination of ocean modeling, data assimilation scheme and observed data sets. I would rather include in this study a global CMEMS ocean/sea ice reanalysis to be compared with TOPAZ4.

-A: Thank you for this comment. We agree that evaluating more global reanalysis products in CMEMS would be very interesting, and give more knowledge of the uncertainties in the different model systems, but it would go beyond the initial aim of directing our next assimilation work.

As an objective analysis product MOB uses the multivariable optimal interpolation method and can be used as a special representative in reanalysis products just like Simple Ocean Data Assimilation (SODA, Carton et al., 2018) is often used for comparative analysis with respect to other traditional reanalysis products (Uotila et al., 2018).

So in this study, we choose to use these two representative types of reanalysis products in CMEMS to evaluate the new satellite SSS products.

v) The region of interested is the Arctic Ocean, but results are mostly related to the North Atlantic/Nordic Seas area.

-A: Thank you for this comment. In the current evaluation, the comparison in the Beaufort Sea has been presented referred to the independent SSS from BGEP and CLIVAR, which is directly linked to one of the main conclusions to support the BEC product. In addition, our forecast products more focus on the wide Arctic region (north of 60N), where our general interest is and discussed in this study.

In this study, the in situ SSS from CORA5.1 were used by the TOPAZ system either assimilated or filtered during pre-processing for QC. It results these dependent SSS from CORA5.1 primarily are distributed in the Nordic Sea as shown in that figure. There are in general few observations in Arctic, the additional reason is a strictly used limit for the SSS observations - near the surface no deeper than 5 m depth. In fact, if extending the limit to 8 m depth, more SSS observations extracted from Ice-Tethered Profiler (ITP) will be involved. The Fig. A2 shows the locations of the SSS from ITP in the three years. Clearly, the evaluation referred to this dataset would enrich our knowledge of the Arctic SSS uncertainty.



Fig. A2 The locations of the SSS observations extracted at the 8m depth from the ITP living more than 30 days during the years of 2011-2013.

In addition, compared with the in-situ SSS from CORA5.1, the scatterplots of the six SSS products have been added in the revision to investigate the uncertainties according to different areas in the Arctic Ocean, also see the lines of 326-353.

vi) Section 5 summarizes main results but a proper discussion to support the BEC SMOS and the "certain benefit (line 537) is missing. These points significantly detract from the conclusions of the study, make the conclusions much weaker than the present manuscript states.

-A: Thank you for this comment. The revision manuscript includes more discussion about this issue, with more consistence to the present results.

English need to be generally improved.

-A: Thanks for your comments. We will further improve the concerned parts.

Evaluation of Arctic Ocean surface salinities from SMOS against a regional reanalysis and in situ data

Jiping Xie[1], Roshin P. Raj[2], Laurent Bertino[2], Annette Samuelsen[2], and Tsuyoshi Wakamatsu[2]

1. Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center, N5006 Bergen, Norway
2. Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center and Bjerknes Centre for Climate Research, Bergen, N5006 Bergen, Norway

Correspondence to: Jiping. Xie (jiping.xie@nersc.no)

Formatted: Header

Deleted: and two CMEMS reanalyses

Deleted: -

Deleted: datasets

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Font color: Text 1

Deleted: Raj[1]

Deleted: Bertino[1, 2]

Deleted: Samuelsen[1, 2]

Deleted: Wakamatsu[1, 2]

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶
¶
¶

Abstract

Recently two gridded Sea Surface Salinity (SSS) products that cover the Arctic Ocean have been derived from the European Space Agency's (ESA) Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) mission; one developed by the Barcelona Expert Centre (BEC) and the other developed by the Ocean Salinity Expertise Center of the Centre Aval de Traitement des Données SMOS at IFREMER (CEC). The uncertainties of these two SSS products are quantified during the period of 2011-2013 against other SSS products: one data assimilative regional reanalysis, one data-driven reprocessing in the framework of the Copernicus Marine Environment Monitoring Services (CMEMS), two climatologies: the 2013 World Ocean Atlas (WOA) and the Polar science center Hydrographic Climatology (PHC), and in-situ datasets, both assimilated and independent. The CMEMS reanalysis comes from the TOPAZ4 system which assimilates a large set of ocean and sea-ice observations using an Ensemble Kalman Filter (EnKF). Another CMEMS product is the Multi-OBservations reprocessing (MOB), a multivariate objective analysis combining in-situ data with satellite SSS. The monthly root mean squared deviations (RMSD) of both SMOS products, compared to the TOPAZ4 reanalysis, reach 1.5 psu in the Arctic summer, while in the winter months the BEC SSS is closer to TOPAZ4 with a deviation of 0.5 psu. The comparison of CEC satellite SSS against in-situ data shows too fresh Atlantic waters in the Barents Sea, the Nordic seas, and in the northern North Atlantic Ocean, consistently with the abnormally fresh deviations against TOPAZ4. When compared against independent in-situ data in the Beaufort Sea, the BEC product shows the smallest bias (<0.1 psu) in summer and the smallest RMSD (1.8 psu), although all six SSS products share a common challenge to represent fresher water masses (<24 psu). Along the Norwegian coast and at the southwestern coast of Greenland, the BEC SSS shows smaller errors than TOPAZ4 and indicates the potential value of assimilating the satellite-derived salinity in this system.

Keywords: Arctic Ocean; sea surface salinity; SMOS; reanalysis;

Formatted ... [1]
Deleted: ¶ ... [2]
Deleted: stratification of the upper …rctic Ocean is ... [4]
Formatted ... [3]
Formatted ... [5]
Deleted: , independently
Deleted: in Spain
Formatted ... [6]
Formatted ... [7]
Deleted: (CECOS)
Formatted ... [8]
Deleted: Traitemenent des Donnees SMOS (CATDS) in ... [9]
Formatted ... [10]
Deleted: two
Deleted: products providing the Arctic SSS
Formatted ... [11]
Formatted ... [12]
Deleted: one global, and another regional product. ... [13]
Formatted ... [14]
Deleted: and ocean
Formatted ... [15]
Deleted: with
Formatted ... [16]
Deleted: , the global reanalysis combines in-situ and ... [17]
Formatted ... [18]
Deleted: ensemble optimal interpolation method. In this ... [19]
Formatted ... [20]
Deleted: the climatology both World Ocean Atlas (WOA) ... [21]
Formatted ... [22]
Deleted: datasets during 2011-2013. For the validation
Formatted ... [23]
Deleted: observations are divided in two; those that ... [24]
Formatted ... [25]
Deleted: -situ observations show largest disagreements ... [26]
Formatted ... [27]
Deleted: summer SSS from the
Formatted ... [28]
Deleted: has
Formatted ... [29]
Deleted: - saline - bias (~0.6 psu) with the smallest root ... [30]
Formatted ... [31]
Deleted: of this product into the forthcoming Arctic ... [32]
Formatted ... [33]
Formatted ... [34]
Formatted ... [35]
Deleted: absolute deviation;
Deleted: ¶ ... [36]

1. Introduction

The sea surface salinity (SSS) plays a key role in tracking processes in the global water cycle through precipitation, evaporation, runoff, and sea-ice thermodynamics (Vialard and Delecluse, 1998; Sumner and Belaineh, 2005; Vancoppenolle et al., 2009; Yu, 2011). SSS is known to impact the oceanic upper mixing significantly (Latif et al., 2000; de Boyer Montegut et al., 2004; Maes et al., 2006; Furue et al., 2018) and via its effect on the surface layer density (Johnson et al, 2012). The SSS also affects the decadal variability of hydrography in the upper waters of the North Atlantic (Reverdin et al., 1997). Using a coupled atmosphere-ocean model and an observed SSS climatology dataset, Mignot and Frankignoul (2003) attributed the interannual variability of the Atlantic SSS to two factors: anomalous Ekman advection and the freshwater flux. Additionally, the increased melting of glaciers and sea-ice in the Arctic (McPhee et al., 1998; Macdonald et al., 1999) leads to significant changes in the salinity distribution and fresh water pathways (Steele and Ermold, 2004; Morison et al., 2012). The freshwater flux is regarded as one of the least constrained parameters in ocean models due to poorly known river discharge, precipitation, and glacial/sea-ice melt (e.g., Tseng et al., 2016; Furue et al., 2018). In ocean models the sea-surface freshwater flux is often adjusted directly or the SSS is restored to its corresponding climatological value to avoid salinity drift.

Monitoring SSS from space is crucial for understanding the global water cycle and the ocean dynamics, especially in the Arctic Ocean where our knowledge of the SSS variability is limited due to non-homogenous and sparse in-situ data. The European Space Agency's (ESA) Soil Moisture and Ocean Salinity (SMOS) satellite, launched in November 2009, consists of the Microwave Imaging Radiometer using Aperture Synthesis (MIRAS) instrument, a passive 2-D interferometric radiometer operating in L-band (1.4 GHz, 21 cm), that measures the brightness temperature (BT) emitted from the Earth. The L-band microwave is highly sensitive to water salinity, which influences the dielectric constants in the sea, and is less susceptible to atmospheric or vegetation-induced attenuation than higher frequency measurements (Font et al., 2010; Kerr et al., 2010; Mecklenburg et al., 2012). Committed to provide global salinities averaged over 10-30 days with an accuracy of 0.1 psu in the open ocean, ESA provides the MIRAS data into SMOS Level 1 (L1) and Level 2 (L2) products through a set of sequential processors (Mecklenburg et al., 2012; ESA, 2017).

Formatted: Header

Deleted: to track hydrological

Deleted: de Boyer Montegut et al., 2004;

Deleted: dominance

Deleted:) the

Deleted: affects the thermohaline circulation

Deleted: northern

Deleted: Frankgnoul

Deleted: ¶
Increase in the freshwater content of the Arctic Ocean due to…

Deleted:), a

Deleted: change in the global warming scenario, can leads to…

Deleted: However, the

Deleted: the small-scale features of

Deleted: general, to avoid salinity drift in the

Deleted: ,

Deleted: by restoring

Deleted: .

Deleted: MIRIAS

Deleted: to measure

Deleted: (Font et al.,

Moved down [1]: 2010; Kerr et al.,

Deleted: 2010).

Deleted: has

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted: Mecklenburg et al., 2012). Since its operational phase started in May 2010, SMOS provides the longest SSS record from space over the global ocean, even compared with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) Aquarius mission (between 2011 and 2015) and its follow-up SMAP (Soil Moisture Active and Passive, since 2015

Over the ocean, Level 2 products (L2OS) are comprised of three different ocean salinities, together with the BTs at the top of atmosphere and at the sea surface, distributed by ESA with swath-based format (e.g., SMOS Team, 2016; ESA, 2017). As a result of the efforts of the national agencies in France and Spain respectively, two Level 3 (L3) data products of SSS are freely available, which are independently developed by the Ocean Salinity Expertise Center (CECOS) of the Centre Aval de Traitement des Données SMOS at IFREMER and the Barcelona Expert Centre. These two SMOS products have successfully resolved the Agulhas salinity front (D'Addezio et al., 2016) and proven useful for the estimating precipitation (Supply et al., 2018). The work of Olmedo et al. (2018) quantitatively evaluate the accuracy of the SMOS Arctic and sub-Arctic SSS to less than 0.35 psu, but this evaluation against Argo data was limited by the lack of data in the Arctic proper. The present study thus investigates the accuracy of these two SMOS SSS products in the Arctic Ocean.

A good estimate of surface salinity is a necessary step towards the knowledge of the three-dimensional water mass properties, for which data assimilation and optimal interpolation methods must be invoked. In a recent study, Uotila et al. (2018) investigated the Arctic salinity in ten reanalysis products and found disagreements within them regarding the seasonal cycle in the upper layer (0-100 m; Figure 12 of Uotila et al., 2018). Note that the full assessment of the Arctic SSS products has been hindered by the extreme paucity of in-situ data in the Arctic. The SSS data from the SMOS mission should in principle allow the evaluation of salinity on a basin scale. In this study, we use two SSS products available from the Copernicus Marine Environment Monitoring Service (CMEMS). The first is the regional Arctic CMEMS reanalysis (ARCTIC-REANALYSIS-PHYS-002-003) from the TOPAZ4 assimilation system, which is a coupled ocean and sea-ice data assimilation system using the Ensemble Kalman filter (EnKF) to assimilate the various ocean and sea-ice observations (e.g., Xie et al., 2017). The second is the CMEMS multivariate optimal interpolation reprocessing (MULTIOBS_GLO_PHY_REP_015_002, Droghei et al., 2018). The latter product directly merges in-situ data with satellite measurements including SMOS without the use of a model and is therefore a reprocessing rather than a reanalysis. There are four other global reanalysis products under CMEMS,

Formatted: Header

Deleted: Committed to provide global salinities averaged over 10-30 days with an accuracy of 0.1 psu for open ocean, ESA is responsible to interpreter the MIRAS data into ¶
SMOS Level 1 (L1) and Level 2 (L2) data through a set of sequential processors (Mecklenburg et al., 2012; ESA, 2017). In the L1 processing stage, the three relevant products of L1A, L1B, and L1C are respectively corresponded to the calibrated engineering visibility, the outputs of image reconstruction and multi-angular BT at the top of atmosphere (TOA). Over oceans

Deleted: TOA…he top of atmosphere and on…t the sea surface, distributed by ESA with swath-based format (e.g., SMOS Team, 2016; ESA, 2017). Under…s a result of the efforts at…f the national agencies in France and Spain respectively, two Level 3 (L3) data products of SSS are freely available, which are independently developed by the Ocean Salinity Expertise Center (CECOS) of the Centre Aval de Traitement…raitement des Donnees…onnées SMOS (CATDS) …t IFREMER and the Barcelona Expert Centre (BEC). Few studies comprehensively investigate their quality uncertainties in the Arctic Ocean at same time, although these two SMOS … These two SMOS products have been …uccessfully used to resolve…esolved the local…gulhas salinity front ... [37]

Formatted: Font color: Text 1, Not Highlight

Deleted: In parallel to these monitoring activities from ... [38]

Deleted: practical choice…ecessary step towards the ... [39]

Deleted: Arctic Ocean salinity, Uotila et al. (2018) ... [40]

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: of monthly salinity

Deleted: of

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted ... [41]

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: (

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted:) shows a considerable spread among these ... [42]

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: extraordinarily poor

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: coverage

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: domain. With the accumulated … The SSS ... [43]

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: is derived …rom the TOPAZ…OPAZ4 ... [44]

Moved down [2]: Xie et al., 2017

Deleted:),…a coupled ocean and sea-ice data ... [45]

Moved (insertion) [2]

Deleted: from …. The second is the CMEMS. This ... [46]

but understanding well their differences requires an intimate knowledge of their setup, and is out of scope of the present study.

We assess the quantitative deviations of Arctic SSS among the two SMOS products and the two CMEMS products, together with two climatology datasets: WOA13 (version 2.0 of World Ocean Atlas of 2013; Zweng et al., 2013) and the older PHC (Polar Science Center Hydrographic Climatology version 3.0; Steele et al., 2001). We further extend the evaluation using available in-situ salinity observations during the years 2011-2013 from different data sources. Can the evaluation against the in-situ data also shed light on the uncertainty of the SMOS products? Can it also give useful information needed for the assimilation of the SMOS SSS products into an Arctic ocean forecast/reanalysis system?

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes all SSS products and the in-situ datasets. The monthly mean SSS from these six products are intercompared and monthly differences from the TOPAZ SSS are analyzed in Section 3. Section 4 evaluates the SSS products against in-situ data, which are divided between assimilated and independent data. A summary of this study is provided in Section 5.

2. Data description

2.1 Sea surface salinity from SMOS

The SSS retrieval from SMOS is subject to biases originating from various non-geophysical sources such as the so-called land-sea contamination and the latitudinal biases, mainly caused by the thermal drift of the instrument. A particular challenge in the Arctic is the sea-ice edge because of ice-ocean contamination. Based on different statistical approaches, match-up criteria, and SMOS data filtering flags, two centers have developed separate processing chains producing a Level 3 SSS product on a regular grid. These two SSS products are hereafter named respectively CEC and BEC in this study, evaluated during the three years of 2011-2013 (see Table 1).

- *The BEC product*

The latest regional Arctic product (version 2.0) from BEC is available from http://bec.icm.csie.es since December 2018 (last access: March 2019). The BEC SSS product was generated from ESA L1B (v620) products, and accumulates salinity

Formatted: Header

Deleted: optimally merged observational data products.¶ In this paper, we assess the performance of …he two CMEMS reanalysis products in comparison to the two SMOS SSS products…roducts, together with the …wo climatology datasets: WOA13 (version 2.0 of World Ocean Atlas of 2013; Zweng et al., 2013) and the older PHC (Polar Science Center Hydrographic Climatology version 3.0; Steele et al., 2001). We further extend the evaluation using available in-situ salinity observations during the years of …011-2013 from different data sources. The…an the evaluation against the in-situ data is …lso expected to…shed light on the uncertainty of SMOS products towards the reliable Arctic SSS monitoring program, which… Can it also give useful information needed for the assimilation of the SMOS SSS products into an Arctic ocean forecast/reanalysis systems in near future. ... [47]

Deleted: In …ection 2,…describes all the assessed …SS products and reference…he in-situ data are described.…atasets. The monthly means of…ean SSS from these six products are intercompared,…and the …onthly deviations referenced to…ifferences from the TOPAZ SSS are analyzed in in …ection 3. Section 4 illustrates the quantitative evaluations of…valuates SSS products against the reference …n-situ data, which are divided into two sets of observations based on whether the observations had been…etween assimilated into TOPAZ or not ... [48]

Deleted: coming…riginating from various unphysical contaminations…on-geophysical sources such as the so-called land-sea contamination and the latitudinal biases likely… mainly caused by the thermal drift of the instrument. A particular challenge in the Arctic is the sea-ice edge because of ice-ocean contamination. Based on different statistical approach, march…pproaches, match-up criteria, and SMOS data filtering flags, the CECOS and the BEC…wo centers have independently …eveloped a…eparate processing chain to produce the relevant …hains producing a Level 3 SSS product on a regular grids. The concerned …rid. These two SSS products are hereafter named respectively named …EC and BEC hereafter …n this study.… ... [49]

Deleted: This …he latest regional Arctic product was developed in by…version 2.0) from BEC targeting high latitudes Oceans and in the Arctic Ocean,…s available from http://cp34-bec.cmima.csie.es ... [50]

Deleted: June 2018).¶ March 2019). The BEC SSS product was generated from ESA L1B (v620) products (SMOS-BEC Team, 2016),… and accumulates the ... [51]

Formatted: English (US)

Field Code Changed

data over 9 days with a spatial grid resolution of 25 km. With respect to its previous version, a systematic bias in the retrieved salinity is corrected by computing the SMOS climatology (the most probable value for a given lat-lon, incidence angle and across-swath distance) which is substituted by a reference value from WOA13. In addition, a temporal bias correction has been refined in this version using near-surface Argo salinity to compute regional averages (see the details in Olmedo et al., 2018).

- *The CEC product*

The third version of LOCEAN SMOS SSS L3 maps (L3_DEBIAS_LOCEAN_v3) was released by the CECOS in July 2018. Every 4 days, the SSS maps averaged over 9 days are released on ftp.ifremer.fr (last access: December 2018). This product uses the Equal-Area Scalable Earth Grid (EASE-Grid) which has limited grid distortion and a spatial resolution of 25km. Using a Bayesian retrieval approach (Kolodzejczyk et al., 2016), the SMOS systematic errors in the vicinity of continents are discarded o improve the product quality. Further, a 'de-biasing' method (Boutin et al., 2018) has been applied in this version of the CEC product, in which the non-Gaussian distribution of SSS is taken into account, refining the latitudinal correction at high latitude, and preserving the naturally seasonal variability of SSS.

2.2 Sea surface salinity from two CMEMS products

- *The TOPAZ4 Arctic MFC reanalysis*

TOPAZ4 uses the version 2.2 of Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM, Chassignet et al., 2003; Bertino and Lisæter, 2008) coupled with a simple thermodynamic sea ice model (Drange and Simonsen, 1996) in which the elastic-viscous-plastic rheology describes the sea ice dynamics (Hunke and Dukowicz, 1997). The model domain covers the Arctic Ocean and the north Atlantic Ocean with a horizontal resolution of 12-16 km. In order to obtain an accurate and dynamically consistent reanalysis in the Arctic Ocean, the deterministic EnKF (DEnKF; Sakov and Oke, 2008) was implemented in TOPAZ with a dynamical ensemble of 100 members all driven by perturbed 6-hourly atmosphere forcing from ERA interim (Simmons et al., 2007). The perturbations of precipitations are following a log-normal probability distribution and conserve the ensemble-average total precipitation.

Along the model lateral boundaries in the South Atlantic and in Bering Strait, the temperature and salinity are relaxed to a combined climatology data from PHC and

Formatted: Header

Deleted: for the period of 2011-2013. Using a non-Bayesian approach

Deleted: of the L1B salinity data is debiased against

Deleted: SSS extrapolated from

Deleted: float at 7.5 m depth, which are provided by the Coriolis data center (www.coriolis.eu.org). For further processing detail, see

Formatted: English (US)

Deleted: . (2016). The bias corrected data are spatio-temporally interpolated to the L3 binned maps. Then their anomaly is blended with WOA09 SSS climatology (Antonov et al., 2010) using optimal interpolation with 300 km influence radius to produce the final L3 regularly gridded, daily SSS product (OA L3 SSS). The OA L3 SSS maps are served daily on regular 25 km grids for an average period of 9 days.

Deleted: were

Deleted: of CATDS

Deleted: These

Deleted: with

Deleted: accumulation period at every 4 days are provided from 16th January 2010 to 25th December 2017. These products, using Equal-Area Scalable Earth (EASA) Grid in which pixels have a constant area and longitudes are equally spaced but not latitudes, have a spatial resolution of 25km freely available on FTP:

Field Code Changed

Deleted: Beginning from the ESA L1B products, the BTs are reconstructed under apodization window and interpolation procedure (Vergely and Boutin, 2017). Based on a semi-empirical ocean surface model developed internally, three different forward models in the L2 processors are implemented for the SSS retrieval and relevant geophysical parameters (SST, wind, etc.). Only one of these three SSSs from the L2 processors are used as L2OS on an EASE grid, similar to ESA L2OS (v622) products. Using the

Deleted: migrated to

Deleted:), an improved technique to correct systematic biases,…

Deleted: used

Deleted: where

Deleted: Gaussianity

Deleted: *the*

Deleted: *reanalyses in*

Deleted: *reanalyses from TOPAZ*

Deleted: TOPAZ

Deleted:). In the sea ice model,

Deleted:) was used to describe the ice dynamics.

Deleted: northern

WOA. The river discharges are treated as an additional mass and a negative salinity flux. Near the surface, to avoid the salinity drift (Tseng et al., 2016; Furue et al., 2018), a weak relaxation to the same combined climatological SSS with 30 days decay is used as most ocean models, but restricted to the areas where the difference to climatology is smaller than 0.5 psu. The EnKF assimilates various ocean and sea-ice observations (e.g., Xie et al., 2016, 2018) into a multivariate state update of the HYCOM model.

The understanding for the uncertainty of the TOPAZ4 SSS has been hindered by poor coverage of in-situ data over the Arctic domain, although Xie et al. (2017) had comprehensively assessed the TOPAZ4 reanalysis during 1991-2013 against various types of ocean and sea-ice observations. For the sake of brevity, the TOPAZ4 reanalysis SSS is named TP4 hereafter.

- *SSS from the Multi-OBservations dataset*

The CMEMS product of MULTIOBS_GLO_PHY_REP_015_002 combines the SSS observations from in-situ and satellite data, using optimal interpolation (OI, Buongiorno Nardelli et al., 2016; Verbrugge et al., 2018) at weekly interval on a 0.25° x 0.25° regular grid. The main datasets used during the OI processing are: 1) the quality controlled in-situ data, COriolis dataset for Re-Analysis (CORA, Cabanes et al., 2013) distributed through CMEMS; 2) the objectively analyzed SSS and SST data generated from CORA, also distributed by CMEMS, which uses the WOA 2013 climatology as first guess and has been upscaled to the MOB grid as another first guess of the multidimensional OI; 3) The SMOS L3 binned (L3bin) data reprocessed by SMOS-BEC at 0.25° grid, although the previous version 1.0 of the product mentioned above; 4) The daily Reynolds L4 AVHRR_OI Global blended SST product on a 0.25° grid. This product is called MOB hereafter.

2.3 Surface salinity from in-situ data

The in-situ SSS data are acquired here from three quality-controlled datasets. The first data source is CORA from CMEMS (product id: INSITU_GLO_TS_REP_OBSERVATIONS_013_001_b), also used in the MOB SSS. CORA contains temperature and salinity profiles from various in-situ data sources (Cabanes et al., 2013). Since 2013, the CORA dataset has been updated every year

Formatted: Header

Deleted: Near the northern model boundary, a barotropic inflow at the Bering Strait is imposed to involve the impact of Pacific water, which varies seasonally as indicated by observations. Due to the poor knowledge on the river discharge into the Arctic, a monthly climatology is calculated by the precipitation from the ERA interim (Simmons et al, 2007) averaged over 20 years, which was ingested to the Total Runoff Integrating Pathways (TRIP, Oki and Sud, 1998) hydrological model. In the model, the

Deleted: exchange by

Deleted: (

Deleted:)

Deleted: of other

Deleted: adopted

Deleted: constrain

Deleted: less

Moved (insertion) [3]

Deleted: In order to obtain a reliable and dynamically consistent reanalysis in the Arctic Ocean, the deterministic EnKF (DEnKF; Sakov and Oke, 2008) has ... [52]

Moved up [3]: various ocean and sea-ice observations

Deleted: 2016, 2018) are assimilated into the HYCOM ... [53]

Deleted: full evaluation

Deleted: TOPAZ

Deleted: TOPAZ

Deleted: The related

Deleted: product from this reanalysis

Deleted: here after

Deleted: *multivariable Optimal Interpolation*

Deleted: (Verbrugge et al., 2018)

Deleted:) and covers the years of 1993-2017

Deleted: . This product available from ... [54]

Deleted: as follow

Deleted: (product id: ... [55]

Deleted: the

Deleted: analysis system

Deleted: final

Deleted: the

Deleted: field for

Deleted: .

Deleted: which are built separately for descending and ... [56]

Deleted: is used

Deleted: Over the same time period (2011-2013) ... [57]

Deleted: *Salinity near surface*

Deleted: Against the two SMOS products from and the ... [58]

Deleted:). Initially developed to supply in-situ data in ... [59]

and includes all the Argo float profiles, moorings, gliders, Ice-Tethered Profilers (ITP; Toole et al., 2011), XBT, CTD, and XCTD data. The latest version of the dataset, CORA5.1, covers the period of 1950-2016. Figure 1a shows the distribution of SSS (averaged over 0-8 m depth) observations from CORA5.1 (total 69,246 observations) over the domain north of 52°N during the years 2011-2013.

The second source of in-situ data is from the Beaufort Gyre Experiment Project (BGEP, http://www.whoi.edu/website/beaufortgyre/background, last access: 14th December 2018). In order to monitor the natural variabilities of the Beaufort Sea in the Canada Basin, BGEP maintains moorings since 2003 and acquires in-situ measurements over the Beaufort Sea region every summer. Symbols (anti-triangle, square, and star) shown in Fig. 1b indicate the locations of valid SSS observations obtained from BGEP. The in-situ dataset used in this study is obtained from the GO-SHIP (the Global Ocean Ship-based Hydrographic Investigations Program, Talley et al., 2017) database under the Climate Variability and Predictability Experiment (CLIVAR). The SSS observations in the Beaufort Sea are extracted from CLIVAR/GO-SHIP data with EXPOCODE (33HQ20111003 and 33HQ20121005, ref. Mathis and Monacci, 2014), which are available from https://cdiac.ess-dive.lbl.gov/ftp/oceans/CARINA/Healy/ (last access: 18th December 2018). All the valid salinity profiles are averaged within the upper 8 m layer, in order to match at best with the satellite SSS measurements. Contrarily to the CORA data, both BGEP and CLIVAR data are independent from all the evaluated datasets.

3. Intercomparison of monthly SSS fields

Prior to the intercomparison of different SSS products, all the gridded products from satellite, reanalysis and climatology have been mapped on the same grid used in the TP4 model by a "nearest neighbor" interpolation. To quantitatively evaluate the SSS deviation in the Arctic, the bias and the root mean square deviation (RMSD) are defined by

$$\text{Bias} = \frac{1}{p}\sum_{i=1}^{p}(\mathbf{H}_i\mathbf{x}_i^f - s_i) \qquad (1)$$

$$\text{RMSD} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{p}\sum_{i=1}^{p}(\mathbf{H}_i\mathbf{x}_i^f - s_i)^2} \qquad (2)$$

Formatted: Header
Deleted: by the collected profiles in the last full year. ... [60]
Deleted: Note that
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: profiles from CORA5.1 have been used in the ... [61]
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: are 24249
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: °
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: of
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: , and most of them are located in the northern ... [62]
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: sources
Deleted: Aiming at monitoring
Deleted: Gyre
Deleted: is maintaining a set of observing system ... [63]
Deleted: providing
Deleted: observations
Deleted: Gyre in
Deleted: From the BGEP, the valid SSS observations ... [64]
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: start)
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: the right panel of
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: 1. Last of all, we use
Formatted: Font color: Text 1
Deleted: data from
Formatted: Font: Arial, Font color: Text 1
Deleted: . (
Deleted:))
Deleted: Specifically,
Deleted: 5
Deleted: near surface
Deleted: obtain
Deleted: marched observations of
Deleted: for evaluation.
Deleted: converted
Deleted: grids as
Deleted: method
Deleted: difference
Deleted:).

Where p is the length of the time series, $\mathbf{x}_i^{\mathrm{f}}$ is the valid salinity from different sources at the ith time, compared to the reference salinity field $\mathbf{s}_i$. $\mathbf{H}_i$ is the observation operator projecting $\mathbf{x}_i^{\mathrm{f}}$ onto $\mathbf{s}_i$.

- *Monthly mean comparison of SSS*

Figure 2 shows the monthly mean Arctic SSS in March from the six products. Notable differences in the two SMOS products appear in the Nordic Seas, Barents Sea, and around the Labrador Sea in the northern North Atlantic Ocean. At first sight, the large-scale SSS features from SMOS products are similar to the other products. However, the CEC SSS is fresher (as shown by the isolines of 35 psu) compared to the BEC, TP4, MOB and both climatologies. The location of the sea-ice edge in the two SMOS products match comparatively well with the TP4 reanalysis (Fig. 2a, d). In sea-ice covered region, TP4 shows a gradual decrease in SSS from the European to the American sector, with two minima near the Beaufort Sea and the East Siberian Sea (ESS; Fig. 2b) consistently with the PHC (Fig. 2c). Those are unclear in the MOB and WOA (Fig. 2e, f), especially the SSS minimum in the Beaufort Sea. The latter two products also show artificial projection artefacts around the North Pole. Figure 3 shows the corresponding SSS fields in September. In comparison to the March situation, the BEC and CEC SSS in the Nordic Seas are both less saline, indicated by the 35 psu isoline. The sea ice masking of the two SMOS products differ considerably in the Canadian Basin and in the Arctic marginal seas. Although the SSS of TP4, MOB, PHC and WOA agree relatively well in the northern Atlantic Ocean, the discrepancies become dramatic in ice-covered areas. Below the ice or near the sea-ice edge (denoted by the brown thick line in Fig. 2 and 3), TP4 and PHC share common features, which can be explained by the model restoring to PHC. On the other hand, the MOB and WOA differ significantly in spite of WOA being used as input to the MOB. Short of a universal reference for Arctic SSS, the monthly mean SSS deviations will be quantified using TP4 as a reference.

- *Deviation analysis of monthly SSS referred to TP4*

Figure 4 and Figure 5 show the deviations of the monthly mean SSS of the five products with reference to the TP4 SSS in August and September respectively. In August, the two SMOS products (Fig. 4a, c) show coherently negative deviations (~2

Formatted: Header

Deleted: evaluated times

Deleted: which is …ompared to the referred…eference salinity field **s***i* and ... [65]

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman, Bold

Deleted: if needs to project

Deleted: into

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: means of…ean Arctic SSS in March and reveals considerable…rom the six products. Notable differences in the two SMOS products. Notable differences are found in …appear in the Nordic Seas, Barents Sea, and around the Labrador Sea in Northern …he northern North Atlantic Ocean. In general, overall…t first sight, the large-scale SSS maps…eatures from SMOS products are consistent with SSS of …imilar to the two reanalysis…ther products and the two climatology products, although the BEC SSS tends to be more saline than… However, the CEC. It…SSS is noticeable that the …resher (as shown by the isolines of 35 psu) compared to the BEC, TP4, MOB and both climatologies. The location of the sea-ice edge in the two SMOS products marches…atch comparatively well with that of …he TP4 reanalysis (Fig. 2a, d). Outside of the …n sea-ice covered region in the Arctic (represented by the 15% sea ice concentration in Fig. 2) there is a good agreement between the subpolar SSS fields of the two reanalyses and the climatologies. Over the sea-ice covered region, the … TP4 shows a gradual decrease in SSS from the sea-ice edge in …uropean to the Nordic Seas…merican sector, with the…wo minima around…ear the Beaufort Sea and the East Siberian Sea (ESS; Fig. 2b), being consistent… consistently with the result in the …HC (Fig. 2c). The features mentioned above, especially the minimal center in the Beaufort Sea,…hose are missing…nclear MOI…he MOB and WOA (Fig. 2e, f)…, especially the SSS minimum in the Beaufort Sea. The MOI and the WOA…atter two products also show commonly a potential …rtificial projection issue ... [66]

Deleted: As a contrast in summer, Fig. …igure 3 shows the corresponding SSS fields in September respectively from the SMOS products, the reanalyses and the climatologies. Considerable differences in the two SMOS products are also found in Fig. 3 similar to that shown in Fig. 2. The SSS field from CEC is relatively fresher then the BEC.… In comparison to the climatologies, the BEC SSS reproduces a much better representation…arch situation, the BEC and CEC SSS in the Nordic Seas are both less saline, indicated by the 35 psu isoline. The sea ice masking of the surface salinity in this region. As to the SSS from the reanalyses (TP4…wo SMOS products differ considerably in the Canadian Basin and MOI) and the climatologies (PHC and WOA), Fig. 3 shows a good agreement in the Northern…n the Arctic marginal seas. Although the SSS of TP4, MOB, PHC and WOA agree relatively well in the northern Atlantic Ocean. However… the discrepancies among them collectively emerge under the sea-ice cover in the Arctic. Over…ecome dramatic in ice- ... [67]

Deleted: (BEC, PHC, CEC, MOI, and WOA), referred to the TP4. The…

psu) in the marginal seas of the Beaufort Sea, the ESS, the Laptev Sea, and the Kara Sea. In the North Atlantic Ocean, away from the sea-ice edge, the deviation of the BEC from TP4 is lower (bias less than 0.5 psu). Focusing on the Arctic domain (>60°N), the mean deviation of the BEC SSS is -0.87 psu and its root mean square is 1.75 psu. The CEC SSS shows considerable negative deviations over 1 psu in the northern Atlantic, from north of Denmark Strait to the west coast of Ireland. This is remarkably different from the BEC, and does not discern the subpolar from the subtropical waters there (Hátún et al., 2005). The deviations of MOB and the two climatology products are comparatively small in the open ocean of the northern Atlantic (Fig. 4b, e). Near and below the sea-ice cover, the deviations are much larger, particularly both the MOB and WOA show strong saline anomalies (> 1 psu) in the Eurasian basin and low anomalies in the American basin.

In September, the SSS deviations of BEC, MOB, PHC and WOA show similar fresher patterns as in August, but the CEC deviations becomes surprisingly positive around the ice edge. The SSS deviation of CEC, averaged over the Arctic domain (>60°N), swaps from -0.42 to 0.42 psu from one month to the next one. The seasonal evolution of monthly SSS deviations from TP4 for all five remaining products, averaged over the Arctic, are shown in Fig. 6. Among the five products, the MOB shows the strongest seasonality with the RMSD higher than 4 psu in July and August (Fig. 6a), and close to 2 psu in winter. The spatially averaged deviation is much fresher than TP4, over -2 psu in summer and -0.5 psu in winter (Fig. 6b). The deviations of the two SMOS SSS show a relatively smaller seasonality (Fig. 6a). During summer months, their RMSDs reach 1.5 psu (Fig. 6a) in summer, and they decrease to 0.5 and 1.0 psu (for BEC and CEC respectively). Throughout the whole year, the BEC RMSDs (Fig. 6a) are consistently smaller than that of CEC, and the seasonal cycles are different. This shows that the BEC SSS is closest to TP4, although it is overall fresher in the Summer.

4. Evaluation against in-situ observations

The misfits of the six SSS products from SMOS, CMEMS and climatologies are calculated as in Eqs. (1) and (2) against the pointwise in-situ observations described in Section 2.3. For TP4, the SSS evaluation is conducted on the same model day as

Formatted: Header

Deleted: along the sea-ice edge

Deleted: Highlighted

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Deleted: SSS deviation of BEC in August is about -0.5 psu with RMSD of 1.51 psu. Away from the sea-ice edge, the deviation of BEC has a slight positive bias widely distributed in the Northern Atlantic Ocean. For the CEC SSS, the averaged deviation is about -0.42 psu with RMSD about 1.73 psu. Notably clear negative deviations appear in both BEC and CEC products consistently along the sea-ice edge in the Beaufort Sea, the ESS, the Laptev Sea and the Kara Sea. However, the deviations of two SMOS products in August have clear differences over the north Atlantic and Arctic domain. While the CEC has considerable negative deviations in the northern Atlantic with a minimum over 1 psu located at the north of Denmark Strait, it has relatively strong positive deviations near the coasts of the marginal seas around the Arctic.¶
The deviations in the northern Atlantic in MOI (Fig. 4d) and the two climatology products are surprisingly small (Fig. ...

Moved down [4]: 4b, e).

Deleted: However, over the sea-ice covered region and its surrounding sea waters, the differences are rather significant. The PHC has a relatively small negative deviation over the majority of the Arctic and north Atlantic Oceans (Fig. 4b). However, around the sea-ice edge, the deviations are much larger. On the other hand, MOI and WOA have strong positive deviations over the Eurasian basin (> 1 psu), with respective RMSD of 4.21 and 3.29 psu in the whole Arctic region.¶
In September (Fig. 5d, e), the SSS deviations of MOI and WOA still show an anomalously large RMSD of 2.96 and 2.28 psu respectively. The averaged SSS deviation of PHC (Fig. 5b) becomes slightly less than in August mainly due to the positive deviations along the sea-ice edge in the marginal seas. Although the two SMOS SSS products from SMOS have the smallest deviation among the five products (Fig. 5a, c) with ... [68]

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: about -1.5 psu. This suggests the MOI SSS is quite close to the WOA in the Arctic domain. As for ... [69]

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Moved (insertion) [4]

Deleted: deviation has a significant seasonality of the mean deviations over -0.5 psu during summer and less ... [70]

Formatted: English (US)

Formatted: Normal

Deleted: by

Deleted: Referred to Eqs. 1-2, the quantitative

Deleted: the

Deleted: the reanalyses

Deleted: the

Deleted: discrete

Deleted: and BEC

the in-situ observations. Owing to the fact that the SSS from BEC, CEC and MOB are averaged over either 9 days or one week (see Table 1), the product dates at the center of the averaging window lag 5 or 4 days compared to the observation date. For PHC and WOA, the in-situ observations are sorted to monthly bins and evaluated for each month. The quantitative evaluation is divided into two main sections starting with dependent and then independent observations.

4.1 Against SSS from CORA5.1

As shown in Fig. 1a, the distribution of SSS observations from CORA5.1 over the Arctic is very inhomogeneous during the three years. Due to this, the evaluation of the gridded SSS products against in-situ observations is restricted to the observation-rich regions. The SSS misfits bias and RMSD for the six products are reported in Table 2 according to the eight Arctic sub-regions defined previously (Figure 1a). The observations are displayed on scatterplots (Figure 7 and 8) to exhibit their uncertainties for fresh and saline waters in different areas.

- *Central Arctic*

Figure 7 shows the SSS products compared with discrete observations in the central Arctic (sub-regions S0, S1, S2, and S3). The observed SSS in S0 and S1 are mainly from the ITP at a minimal depth of 8 m. Around the North Pole (S0), where the satellite SSS are absent, the TP4 reanalysis and MOB reprocessing show opposite biases: +0.48 psu and -0.52 psu respectively (Table 2). The two climatologies used by them, PHC and WOA respectively, also show opposite biases. Considering the latter climatologies, both SSS scatterplots shows a fresh bias for high salinity water (>33 psu) and a saline bias for low salinity water (<31 psu).

In the Canadian basin (in S1), the two climatological SSSs show an obvious gap in comparison to the ITP observations. Comparing to the fresh in-situ SSS from 24 to 30 psu, the PHC has strong saline bias (from 2 to more than 5 psu). On the other hand, the WOA shows both a fresh bias for relatively high salinity water (>28 psu) and saline bias for fresher water (<26 psu). Owing to the different time periods (Table 1) of the in-situ data they used, this result confirms the freshening of the Canadian basin since in the 1990s (Morison et al., 2012).

In the S1 sub-region, the satellite SSS from BEC and CEC have only 20 and 42 data points for evaluation respectively. The resulting scatterplots show a significantly

Formatted: Header

Deleted: observing

Deleted: . For CEC and MOI, the corresponding evaluation is made…

Deleted: product

Deleted: nearest backwards in time to the observing dates…

Deleted: bin

Deleted: in

Deleted: SSS observations from CORA5.1 during the three years are distributed unevenly over the pan-Arctic area. Due to the non-homogenous

Deleted: the observations

Deleted: limited to the observational-dense domains. Here, we specifically focus our evaluation over the two domains: the northern Atlantic Ocean during the entire period and the Beaufort Sea during summer seasons when the surface is exposed owing to the sea ice melting.…

Formatted: Font: Italic, Font color: Auto

Deleted: ¶
In the northern Atlantic Ocean and Nordic Seas¶
In the northern Atlantic Ocean including the sub-regions from S4 to S7 (Fig. 1a), 23626 salinity observations are available for this evaluation, corresponding to more than 97% of all valid observations over the Arctic domain from CORA5.1. Figure 7 shows the mean deviation of SSS for each product during the years of 2011-2013. Over the northern Atlantic oceans including the Norwegian Sea and the Greenland Sea, the considerable negative biases (<-0.16 psu) are shown in the products of CEC, PHC and WOA (Fig. 7c, d, f). Among of them, the CEC shows significantly high spatial variability. The SSS products of BEC, TP4 and MOI (Fig. a, b, e) have relatively small bias (<0.08 psu), especially the MOI shows the minimal deviations in most of this region. ¶
If only comparison of the SSS between the BEC and the TP4, the latter has two stronger positive biases appearing along the southern Norwegian coast and along the Greenland west coast, although it has obviously smaller bias than the BEC in the open seas. Against the Argo profiles from the Coriolis data center, SMOS-BEC Team (2016) found the RMSDs of the BEC SSS in the Arctic (>50°N) are mostly less than 0.4 psu, but also showing the interannual variability like in the summer of 2012 the RMSD close to 0.8 psu. The RMSDs of the BEC SSS in the northern Atlantic Ocean (S6 and S7 in Table 1) are less than 0.4 psu, but near the coast regions (S4 and S5 in Table 1) the RMSDs are over 1 psu. It further indicates the BEC quality has a strong dependency on the locations. ¶
Figure 8 shows the Root Mean Square (RMS) deviations of SSS for the all products over the northern Atlantic Ocean and the Nordic Seas. Averaged in the local domain, the maximal deviation among the six products can be found about 1.0 psu in the CEC (Fig. 8d) in which high spatial variability is also profound. The minimal deviation among them is found about 0.4 psu in the MOI (Fig. 8e), in which similar magnitude of the RMSDs are distributed over the entire domain relatively ... [7]

positive salinity bias (>4 psu) for fresh waters (<27 psu). For relatively higher salinity water (> 27 psu), the CEC has a stronger saline bias than the BEC.

In the Kara Sea (sub-region S2), the TP4 SSS has the smallest RMSD at 1.7 psu, which is significantly smaller than other products. The scatterplot also shows a good linear relationship between the TP4 and the in-situ SSS, while other products generally show fresh biases, indicating that the SSS variability in the Kara Sea is well captured by TP4. In the Barents Sea (sub-region S3), TP4 gives as well the smallest misfit (RMSD: 0.34 psu; bias: -0.14 psu). The SSS scatterplots exhibits linear relationships for all products except the CEC, which underestimates the Atlantic water SSS.

- *Northern North Atlantic and Nordic Seas*

Figure 8 shows the paired scatterplots of the six SSS products in the subpolar seas from sub-regions S4 to S7 (see Fig. 1a). In S4 and S5, the bias of SSS products is relatively small, less than 0.15 psu (Table 2), except for CEC in S4 and TP4 in S5, both too saline by 0.2 psu. The scatterplots further indicate that low salinity waters are too saline in all SSS products in S4 (<31 psu) and in S5 (<28 psu). Meanwhile, the respective bias and RMSD of the SSS products are less than 0.1 psu and 0.43 psu respectively, except for the CEC in S6 and S7. The MOB SSS has the smallest salinity bias. Among the eight regions compared here (S0 to S7), the SSS bias is lowest in S6 (Irminger Sea).

Over the northern North Atlantic and the Nordic seas, Fig. 9 shows maps of the mean SSS deviation for each product during the period 2011-2013. Considerable negative biases (<-0.2 psu) are found in the CEC, whereas the MOB and WOA have the smallest bias, less than 0.02 psu (Fig. 9 d, e, f). The SSS products from BEC, TP4 and PHC (Fig. 9 a, b, c) have slightly higher bias (~0.05 psu) in comparison to the MOB and WOA. On average, the BEC bias is only -0.04 psu, much smaller than that of the CEC (<-0.2 psu). Focusing on the BEC SSS, Fig 9a shows that while a fresh bias dominates the Nordic Seas, the product is too saline in the northern North Atlantic and the North Sea.

The inter-comparison of the biases against the in-situ data in Fig. 9a and 9b exhibits two strong positive biases of TP4 along the Norwegian coast and along the West Greenland coast. Notably, the BEC has smaller bias along both coasts, although it has a slightly saline bias offshore. This indicates potential benefits of the BEC SSS

Formatted: Header

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: the summer

for the TOPAZ system along the Norwegian and Greenland coasts, were it successfully assimilated into the system. Figure 10 shows RMSDs of SSS for all the products over the northern North Atlantic Ocean and the Nordic Seas. On average, the largest uncertainty is found with the CEC (~1.0 psu; Fig. 10d), with RMSDs as large as 1.5 psu in the Greenland Sea and the Barents Sea. The SSS RMSDs for the five other SSS products are much smaller (~0.5 psu).

4.2 Independent SSS in the Beaufort Sea

Independent in-situ data from BGEP and CLIVAR are used during the summer months of 2011-2013 in the Beaufort Sea for the evaluation of the six SSS products (Fig. 11). The in-situ SSS observations range from 15 to 32 psu. The range of BEC SSS is limited to 24 to 31 psu with a minor bias of 0.09 psu and a RMSD of 1.82 psu. On the other hand, the range of TP4 SSS is even shorter from 19 to 32 psu, with a large saline bias of 2.59 psu and a RMSD of 3.63 psu. The linear regression coefficients for BEC and TP4 are 0.57 and 0.07 respectively. Looking at the low-salinity observations (~27 psu) collected at (136.4°W, 70.5°N) on 15th August 2011, marked by anti-triangles (Fig. 1b) near the Mackenzie River estuary, TP4 has a significant negative bias (< -4 psu) visible as the outliers above the dashed-black line in Fig. 11a. This hints to a lack of fresh water signatures from river discharge. The range of PHC SSS climatology is only reaching from 24 to 31 psu, similar to TP4, with a saline bias of 1.65 psu and RMSD of 2.85 psu. Compared to the TP4 deviation at the Makenzie River basin, the PHC saline bias is present, but smaller. The strong positive bias in TP4 at these points can then be partly attributed to the SSS relaxation of the TOPAZ model towards the PHC climatology, albeit rather weak. The range of the WOA is much wider, from 12 to 31 psu. Among the six products, the WOA bias is the smallest (~0.02 psu) over the Beaufort Sea during all three summers. However, it should be noted that the variability of in-situ observations is very large for salinities lower than 24 psu, which contributes to the large RMSD (>3.0 psu) of both PHC and WOA. It confirms that the two climatologies have a sizable uncertainty over low salinity regions (<24 psu) in the Arctic Ocean. The CEC SSS ranges from 13 psu to 34 psu, which is much wider than the range of the BEC SSS. The saline bias of CEC is however larger at 2.38 psu and its RMSD is about quite large at 3.77 psu. Futhermore, the CEC deviations from the in-situ observations are larger in waters fresher than 27 psu. The MOB combined product

Formatted: Header

Deleted: are plotted in Fig. 9. The

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: from in-situ data …ange from 15 to 33 psu. The BEC SSS ranges from 24 to 31 psu with a bias of 0.65 psu and RMSD of 2.63 psu. On the same panel, the TP4 ranges from 26 to …2 psu, with a bias of 2.73 psu and RMSD of 3.85 psu. … The range of BEC SSS is limited to 24 to 31 psu with a minor bias of 0.09 psu and a RMSD of 1.82 psu. On the other hand, the range of TP4 SSS is even shorter from 19 to 32 psu, with a large saline bias of 2.59 psu and a RMSD of 3.63 psu. The linear regression coefficients for BEC and TP4 are 0.6…7 and 0.15…7 respectively. It is found that…ooking at the significant deviations of BEC and TP4 from the in-situ…ow-salinity observations are attributed to the particular four observations around ... [72]

Formatted ... [73]

Deleted: collected …n 15th August 2011 of which locations are… marked in Fig. 1b …y anti-triangles. They become on the continental shelf…(Fig. 1b) near estuary of …ackenzie River, where the strong fresh water signature could be originated to ... [74]

Deleted: For the climatologies, the …he range of PHC ranges…SS climatology is only reaching from 25…4 to 31 psu, which is …imilar to that of …P4, with a saline bias of 1.77…5 psu and RMSD of 3.13….85 psu. Compared to the TP4 deviation at the Makenzie River basin, the deviations of the …HC are quite bias is present, but slightly lower range. This infers that the…maller. The strong positive bias in the …P4 at these points mostly originated…an then be partly attributed to the SSS relaxation in…f the TOPAZ model towards the PHC climatology. In case… albeit rather weak. The range of another climatology, …he WOA ranges…s much wider, from 12 to 31 psu, much wider than the range of PHC. This contributes the minimal bias of the WOA about 0.02 psu among… Among the six products, the WOA bias is the smallest (~0.02 psu) over the Beaufort Sea during all the…hree summers. However, it should be noticed…oted that the range…ariability of in-situ observations becomes much wider under…s very large for salinities lower than 24 psu, which contributes a major source of …o the large RMSD over …>3.0 psu for… of both of …HC and WOA. It further suggests both climatology products…onfirms that the two climatologies have a big representing…izable uncertainty over the coastal fresh sea water…ow salinity regions (<24 psu) dominated region… ... [75]

Deleted: The CEC SSS ranges from 18 psu to 34 psu which is significantly wider than the range of the BEC. The SSS bias of …he CEC SSS ranges from 13 psu to 34 psu, which is about…uch wider than the range of the BEC SSS. The saline bias of CEC is however larger at 2.7…8 psu and its RMSD is about quite large at 3.9…7 psu. Again…uthermore, the CEC deviations from the in-situ observations become wider…re larger in the range where the SSS is less…aters fresher than 24…7 psu. For the MOI, the satellite and in-situ data…he MOB combined product, a ... [76]

performs poorly with the largest negative bias (>5 psu) and an RMSD in excess of 8 psu. In contrast to the other five SSS products, the anomalously fresh SSS observed around the point (140°W, 71°N) near the Mackenzie River estuary are represented by even fresher values of 12 psu in MOB, which may hint at an amplification of the anomalies.

In order to characterize dependencies of the bias for the six SSS products against the in-situ data, their absolute differences are plotted as a function of observed SSS in Fig. 12. In general, all products show considerable deviations with the maxima reaching 8 to 14 psu. While the absolute misfits of most of the SSS products monotonically increase towards lower salinity, the bias of MOB shows its peak around 20 psu shown in Fig. 12c. The fourth-order polynomial curve function,

$$F(S) = p_1 S^4 + p_2 S^3 + p_3 S^2 + p_4 S + p_5 \quad (3)$$

is then fitted to the absolute bias for each of the SSS products, where S represents the in-situ salinity. The fitting coefficients, p_1 to p_5, for each product are listed in Table 3. The norm residuals are displayed on each panel in Fig. 12 and clearly show that fitting for MOB has the largest uncertainty, while the minimal norm residuals are about 10 and 7 psu^2 respectively for BEC and TP4. This suggests the derived fitting curves for BEC and TP4 have credible skill in charactering its error distribution as a function of the observed SSS. Both curves monotonically decrease towards the salinity higher than 28 (30) psu for BEC (TP4) and increase slightly afterwards. The absolute bias in TP4 is consistently larger than that in BEC. The fitted curves of PHC and WOA have the similar functional forms to TP4 and BEC, but with lower amplitudes.

5. Conclusions

To understand the uncertainties in the Arctic SSS, our study evaluates the two gridded SMOS SSS products (BEC and CEC), two CMEMS products (TP4 and MOB), and two climatology products (PHC and WOA) by their inter-comparison and comparisons against both of dependent and independent in-situ datasets during the years of 2011-2013.

The differences in the spatial coverage of the two SMOS SSS were clearly shown in the monthly mean (Fig. 2 and Fig.3), due to the different retrieval applied in these two datasets. The spatial distributions of SSS from TP4 and PHC are considerably close to each other, mainly as for the fact that the SSS in the TOPAZ model is relaxed

Formatted: Header

Deleted: is significant of more than 4…>5 psu) and the…n RMSD is more than 7…n excess of 8 psu. Contrast…n contrast to the other five SSS products, the anomalously fresh SSS observed around the point (140°W, 71°N) near the estuary of …ackenzie River estuary are represented by further…ven fresher values of around…12 psu in the MOI ... [77]

Deleted: …n order to characterize dependencies of the bias for the six SSS products against the in-situ data, their absolute biases…ifferences are paired …lotted as a function of observed SSS in Fig. 10…2. In general, all products show considerable deviations by…ith the maxima reaching 8 to 14 psu. While the absolute misfits of the …ost of the SSS products monotonically increase towards lower salinity range… the bias of MOI…OB shows its peak around 20 psu shown in Fig. 10c…2c. The fourth-order polynominal ... [78]

Deleted: fit…itted to the absolute bias for each of the SSS products, where S represents the in-situ salinity. The fitting coefficients from… p_1 to p_5, for each product are listed in Table 2…. The norm residuals printed…re displayed on each panel of…n Fig. 10…2 and clearly show that fitting for MOI contains…OB has the largest uncertainty, while the minimal norm residuals no more than…re about 10 and 7 psu^2 are obtained…espectively for BEC and TP4. This suggests the derived fitting curves for BEC and TP4 have credible skill in charactering its error distribution as a function of the observed SSS. Both curves monotonically decrease towards the salinity greater…igher than 28 (30) psu for BEC (TP4) and increase slightly afterwards. The absolute bias in TP4 is consistently larger than that in BEC. Although with lower amplitudes, the…he fitted curves of PHC and WOA have the similar functional forms of…o TP4 and BEC. Their relative relation of the fitted curves, PHC being consistently larger than WOA, is also similar to that between TP4 and BEC ... [79]

Deleted: In order to…o understand the uncertainty of monitoring and reproduction of …ncertainties in the Arctic SSS in existing multi-source datasets,… our evaluates the two gridded SMOS SSS products (BEC and CEC), two CMEMS reanalyzed …roducts (TP4 and MOI…OB), and two climatologies …limatology products (PHC and WOA) are first evaluated …y intercomparison…heir inter-comparison and secondly…omparisons against both of dependent and independent in-situ data ... [80]

Deleted: means of SMOS SSS …ean (Fig. 2 and Fig.3) clearly show the two SMOS products have equivalent data coverage in winter months but obviously different in summer months…, due to the different retrieval different BT filtering flags.…n these two datasets. The salinity patterns…patial distributions of SSS from TP4 and PHC are considerably close to each other, which is consistent to ... [81]

Formatted: Header

towards PHC at each time step. Relative to TP4, the SSS deviations of the four products (BEC, MOB, WOA and PHC) in summer show similar magnitude over the open waters. On the contrary, the CEC SSS shows a negative bias (<-1 psu) over the region extending from the Iceland towards the western side of Ireland (Fig. 4, 5), but clearly the BEC SSS has a slightly negative bias over the region. In general, the most significant differences in the SSS deviations relative to TP4 are found under the sea-ice cover and in its surrounding marginal ice zones.

Furthermore, the intercomparison of the SSS products shows that the BEC SSS in August and September (Fig. 4, 5) has consistent negative deviations along the sea-ice edge in the Beaufort Sea and the Chukchi Sea, but the CEC SSS has opposite deviations in these two months. Thus, it may be arguable that the two SMOS products would give rise to significantly different effects to the upper ocean state in the TOPAZ system if it to be assimilated into. Hence the SSS quantitative evaluations of two products for optimal selection or blending would be worth of investigating further.

Focusing on the wide Arctic domain (>60°N), the deviations of the five SSS products relative to TP4 show diverse seasonal characteristics (Fig. 6). Although the SSS products of BEC and CEC have the similar deviation of about 1.5 psu (Fig. 6a) in summer, the BEC deviations in winter months are clearly lower (~0.5 psu). The deviations of MOB and WOA (Fig. 6a) varies from over 1.5 psu in winter to around 4 psu in summer, which suggests a considerable gap with the TP4. Consequently, the intercomparison suggests that the BEC SSS has the most consistent pattern with the TP4 SSS among all other SSS products.

Against the in-situ data from CORA5.1 which were used in both TP4 and MOB, the quantitative evaluations of the six SSS products were investigated in the eight sub-regions (Fig. 1a). It was divided into two parts: in the central Arctic Ocean; the northern North Atlantic Ocean and the Nordic Seas. Due to the limited coverage of BEC and CEC in S1, the scatterplots (Fig. 7) show a positive saline bias (>4 psu) for low salinity water (< 27 psu). However, the salinity bias of BEC is slightly reduced for relative high salinity water (> 27 psu). In the Kara Sea and the Barents Sea, the TP4 SSS has the minimal RMSD compared with others (Table 2). The BEC scatterplots in S2 and S3 (Fig. 7) have similar distributions with respect to TP4.

In the northern North Atlantic Ocean and the Nordic Seas (S6, S4, and S3; Fig. 8), the scatterplots of the CEC SSS show that it underestimates the Atlantic water

Deleted: to the…owards PHC SSS …t each time step. The monthly SSS patterns of MOI are clearly close to that of WOA, and they both show some partial incompatibility near the North Pole owing to the map projection (shown as in Fig. 2). ¶
Relative to TP4, the TP4 …SS, the…deviations of the four products (BEC, MOI…OB, WOA and PHC) in summer show similar magnitude over the open waters, but… On the contrary, the CEC SSS shows an obviously… negative bias (<-1 psu) over the region extending from the Iceland towards the western side of Ireland (Fig. 4, 5). This significant…, 5), but clearly the BEC SSS has a slightly negative bias of…ver the CEC should be paid further attention in future evaluation studies about this SSS product.…egion. In general, the most significant differences among…n the SSS deviations relative to the …P4 are found under the Arctic …ea-ice cover and in its surrounding marginal seas… ... [82]

Deleted: The…urthermore, the intercomparison of the SSS products shows that the BEC SSS in August and September (Fig. 4, 5) shows…as consistent negative deviations along the sea-ice edge in the Beaufort Sea and the Chukchi Sea, but the CEC along the ice edge shows the…SS has opposite deviations in these two months. This indicates special attention is necessary for selecting a suitable SMOS SSS product to be assimilated into an ocean and sea-ice forecasting system. The … ... [83]

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: impacts to

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: concerned ocean mixing so that the

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: worthy

Formatted ... [84]

Deleted: studying.

Deleted: core

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: °

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: the …P4 show the diversely…iverse seasonal characteristics (Fig. 6). The MOI has the largest seasonality in which the RMSD …lthough the SSS products of BEC and CEC have the similar deviation of about 1.5 psu (Fig. 6a) in summer, the BEC deviations in winter months are clearly lower (~0.5 psu). The deviations of MOB and WOA (Fig. 6a) varies from over 1.5 psu in winter to over…round 4 psu in summer. The second largest seasonality can be found in the WOA with the RMSD ranges from 1.5 psu to 3.5 psu. The ... [85]

Deleted: have been…ere used in the…oth TP4 and the MOI…OB, the quantitative evaluations of the six SSS products have been ... [86]

Deleted: , but in the sea-ice covered region they are hindered by the sparse observations in the Arctic. In the northern Atlantic Ocean domain, the MOI…(S6, S4, and ... [87]

salinity, which also is consistent with the intercomparison results (low salinity deviation) shown in Fig. 4 and 5. The misfits of mean and RMSDs shown in Fig. 9 and 10, suggest the CEC SSS has considerable uncertainty (RMSD of about 1 psu), especially in the Nordic Seas with obvious low salinity biases. On the other hand, the SSS uncertainties of the BEC are significantly lower in comparison to the CEC, but are equivalent compared with TP4 and PHC. Two notable regions where the BEC SSS has lower uncertainties referred to the in-situ observations than the TP4 are along the Norwegian coast and near the west coast of Greenland Island. It is reasonable to expect that they are the most beneficial region in the Nordic Seas if the BEC SSS is successfully assimilated into the TOPAZ system.

Against independent in-situ observations from BGEP and CLIVAR, the SSS evaluation in the Beaufort Sea is performed in the summers of the three years. The linear regression against these independent SSS observations (Fig. 11) suggests the BEC SSS has the smallest RMSD of 1.8 psu with a positive bias of 0.1 psu, and the CEC SSS has larger RMSD of about 3.8 psu with a larger positive bias of 2.4 psu (Fig. 11). On the other hand, the TP4 SSS also shows large RMSD of about 3.6 psu with large positive bias of 2.6 psu. They are smaller than MOB which has the RMSD of 8.2 psu and larger negative bias (-5.0 psu). As for the two climatology products, the RMSDs of WOA and PHC both are more than 2.8 psu, but with significantly smaller bias in WOA. Overall, the large uncertainty found in the linear regression of all products is attributed to large product-observation mismatch against in-situ salinity data of less than 24 psu, which are observed over the continental shelf near the estuary of the Mackenzie River.

In order to characterize the product-data misfits of all six products against in-situ data, a 4th order polynomial function is fitted to the absolute deviation as a function of observed salinity (Fig.12). The absolute deviations of most of the products except for MOB monotonically decrease as observed salinity increases. The norm residuals for TP4 and BEC and are the smallest of 10.2 and 7.0, respectively, among all six products and the fitted curves give certain confidence in estimating the size of the error in the each SSS product. The fitted curve reaches its smallest value of less than 1.0 psu at the in-situ salinity of 28 psu and 30 psu for BEC and TP4 respectively. Both the fitted curves for CEC and MOB have large norm residuals of 18.1 and 68.8 psu^2 respectively. Note that special attention must be paid in usage of MOB in the

Formatted ... [88]
Deleted: along the south-west Norwegian coast and ... [89]
Deleted: Highlighting in the Beaufort Sea, there are 193 ... [90]
Formatted ... [91]
Deleted: 2.63
Formatted ... [92]
Deleted: 65
Formatted ... [93]
Deleted: 9
Formatted ... [94]
Deleted: 71
Formatted ... [95]
Deleted: 9). Equivalently
Formatted ... [96]
Deleted: 85
Formatted ... [97]
Deleted: a
Formatted ... [98]
Deleted: 73
Formatted ... [99]
Deleted: , but they
Formatted ... [100]
Deleted: obviously
Formatted ... [101]
Deleted: the corresponding misfits of the MOI
Formatted ... [102]
Deleted: 7.18
Formatted ... [103]
Deleted: with
Formatted ... [104]
Deleted: of -4.3
Formatted ... [105]
Deleted: .
Formatted ... [106]
Deleted: climatologies
Formatted ... [107]
Deleted: the
Formatted ... [108]
Deleted: have RMSD
Formatted ... [109]
Deleted: 3
Formatted ... [110]
Deleted: small
Formatted ... [111]
Deleted: the
Formatted ... [112]
Deleted: a
Formatted ... [113]
Deleted: for
Formatted ... [114]
Deleted:
Formatted ... [115]
Deleted: , the absolute deviations…of all six products ... [116]

Arctic Ocean due to its large negative bias and the RMSD in regions where the product is based on limited number of observations.

Evaluations of the SSS products against TP4 product and in situ data conducted above suggest certain benefit can be expected in assimilating one of the SMOS salinity products, the BEC SSS, into the TOPAZ Arctic ocean analysis-forecast system. The knowledge of error structure in the SSS products provided in this study will assist to reasonably estimate the observation error for the SMOS product, which is required by a data assimilation system. We recommend that due to the poor spatial coverages of CORA in situ data in the Arctic Ocean, more data - especially from the Arctic Ocean marginal seas - should be compiled from independent data source for validating the SMOS SSS products. In addition, when comparing the two climatology products, PHC and WOA, the SSS scatterplots of the PHC in the central Arctic (Fig. 7) show salinity bias for low saline water. Considering the different time periods of their compiled in-situ data sources (Table 1), it independently verifies that the freshening in the Canada Basin since 1990s is rather significant as discussed by Morison et al. (2012). Based on this evaluation, the next TOPAZ system will use the WOA to replace the PHC as the target relaxation field.

Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the support of CMEMS for the Arctic MFC and partly funding from the European Space Agency in response to the Arctic+Salinity project (Dec 2018-June 2020). Grants of computing time (nn2993k and nn9481k) and storage (ns2993k) from the Norwegian Sigma2 infrastructures are gratefully acknowledged. The BEC SSS is produced by the Barcelona Expert Centre (bec.icm.csic.es) mainly funded by the Spanish National Program on Space. The CEC SSS is distributed by the Ocean Salinity Expertise Center (CECOS) of CATDS at IFREMER, France.

Reference:

Bertino, L., and Lisæter, K. A.: The TOPAZ monitoring and prediction system for the Atlantic and Arctic Oceans, Journal of Operational Oceanography, 1(2), 15–19, doi: 10.1080/1755876X.2008.11020098, 2008

Boutin J., Vergely J.L., Marchand S., D'Amico F., Hasson A., Kolodziejczyk Nicolas, Reul Nicolas, Reverdin G., Vialard J.: New SMOS Sea Surface Salinity with reduced systematic

Formatted: Header

Deleted: RMSD, although its smallest misfits against CORA data in the northern Atlantic oceans among others…

Deleted: Validation

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: product like

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: on

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: earned

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: help us

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: Due

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: the

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Formatted: Font color: Text 1

Deleted: The newest SMOS product (Olmedo et al., 2018) that covers the years of 2010-2017 became available recently. Validation of the SMOS SSS product

Deleted: the longer period together with the extended in situ data is under preparation now

Deleted: step.

Deleted: .

Deleted: www.smos-

Deleted: .)

Deleted: Antonov, J., Seidov, D., Boyer, T., Locarnini, R., Mishonov, A., and Garcia, H.: World Ocean Atlas 2009, Volume 2: Salinity. NOAA Atlas NESDIS 69, NOAA, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C., 2010.¶

errors and improved variability. Remote Sensing of Environment, 214, 115-134, http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2018.05.022, 2018.

Buongiorno Nardelli, B., Droghei, R., and Santoleri, R.: Multi-dimensional interpolation of SMOS sea surface salinity with surface temperature and *in situ* salinity data. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 180, 392–402. doi: 10.1016/j.rse.2015.12.052, 2016

Cabanes, C., A. Grouazel, K. von Schuckmann, M. Hamon, V. Turpin, C. Coatanoan, F. Paris, S. Guinehut, C. Boone, N. Ferry, C. de Boyer Montégut, T. Carval, G. Reverdin, S. Pouliquen, and P. Y. Le Traon: The CORA dataset: validation and diagnostics of in-situ ocean temperature and salinity measurements. Ocean Science, 9, 1-18, *http://www.ocean-sci.net/9/1/2013/os-9-1-2013.html*, doi:10.5194/os-9-1-2013, 2013

Chassignet, E. P., Smith, L. T., and Halliwell, G. R.: North Atlantic Simulations with the Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM): Impact of the vertical coordinate choice, reference pressure, and thermobaricity, J. Phys. Oceanogr., 33, 2504-2526. Doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(2003)033<2504:NASWTH>2.0.CO;2, 2003.

de Boyer Montegut, C., G. Madec, A. Fischer, A. Lazar, and D. Iudicone: Mixed Layer Depth over the Global Ocean: An Examination of Profile Data and a Profile-Based Climatology. *J. Geophys. Res.*, 109 (C12003), 1–20, doi:10.1029/2004JC002378, 2004.

D'Addezio, J. M., and Subrahmanyam, B.: Sea surface salinity variability in the Agulhas Current region inferred from SMOS and Aquarius. Remote Sensing of Environment, 180, 440–452. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.006, 2016

Drange, H. and Simonsen, K.: Formulation of air-sea fluxes in the ESOP2 version of MICOM, Technical Report No. 125 of Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center, 1996.

Droghei, R., Buongiorno Nardelli, B., and Santoleri, R.: A new global sea surface salinity and density dataset from multivariate observations (1993–2016). *Front. Mar. Sci*. 5:84. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2018.00084, 2018

ESA, SMOS data products, available from https://earth.esa.int/documents/10174/1854456/SMOS-Data-Products-Brochure (last access on 12th December 2018), November 2017.

Font, J., Camps, A., Borges, A., Martín-Neira, M., Boutin, J., Reul, N., Kerr, Y. H., Hahne, A., and Mecklenburg, S.: SMOS: The challenging sea surface salinity measurement from space, Proc. IEEE, 98(5), 649–665, DOI: 10.1109/JPROC.2009.2033096, May 2010.

Furue, R., Takatama, K., Sasaki, H., Schneider, N., Nonaka, M., and Taguchi, B.: Impacts of sea-surface salinity in an eddy-resolving semi-global OGCM. Ocean Modelling, 122, 36–56, doi:10.1016/j.ocemod.2017.11.004, 2018

Hátún, H., Sandø, A. B., Drange, H., Hansen, B., and Valdimarsson, H.: Influence of the Atlantic Subpolar Gyre on the Thermohaline Circulation, Science, 309 (5742), 1841-1844, doi:10.1126/science.1114777, 2005

Hunke, E. C., and Dukowicz, J. K.: An elastic-viscous-plastic model for sea ice dynamics, J. Phys. Oceanogr., 27, 1849-1867, https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(1997)027<1849:AEVPMF>2.0.CO;2, 1997.

Johnson, G. C., Schmidtko, S., and Lyman, J. M.: Relative contributions of temperature and salinity to seasonal mixed layer density changes and horizontal density gradients, *J. Geophys. Res.*, **117**, C04015, doi:10.1029/2011JC007651, 2012

Kerr, Y. H., Waldteufel, P., Wigneron, J. P., Delwart, S., Cabot, F., Boutin, J., Escorihuela, M. J., Font, J., Reul, N., Gruhier, C., Juglea, S., Drinkwater, M. R., Hahne, A., Martín-Neira, M., and Mecklenburg, S.: The SMOS mission: New tool for monitoring key elements of the global water cycle, Proc. IEEE, 98(5), 666–687, doi:10.1109/JPROC.2010.2043032, 2010.

Kolodziejczyk, N., Boutin, J., Vergely, J.-L., Marchand, S., Martin, N., and Reverdin, G.: Mitigation of systematic errors in SMOS sea surface salinity. Remote Sensing of Environment, 180, 164–177. doi:10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.061, 2016

Latif, M., Roeckner, E., Mikolajewicz, U., and Voss R.: Tropical stabilization of the thermohaline circulation in a greenhouse warming simulation, J. Clim., 13: 1809–1813, 2000.

Macdonald, R. W., Carmack, E. C., McLaughlin, F. A., Falkner, K. K., and Swift, J. H.: Connections among ice, runoff and atmospheric forcing in the Beaufort Gyre. Geophys. Res. Lett., 26, 2223–2226, 1999

Maes, C., Ando, K., Delcroix, T., Kessler, W. S., McPhaden, M. J., and Roemmich, D.: Observed correlation of surface salinity, temperature and barrier layer at the eastern edge of the western Pacific warm pool, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, **33**, L06601, doi:10.1029/2005GL024772, 2006.

Mathis, J. T., and Monacci, N. M.: Carbon Dioxide and Hydrographic data obtained during the USCGC Healy Cruise HLY1203 in the Arctic Ocean (October 05 - 25, 2012). Available from http://cdiac.ess-dive.lbl.gov/ftp/oceans/CARINA/Healy/HLY-12-03/. Oak Ridge National Laboratory, US Department of Energy, Oak Ridge, Tennessee. doi: 10.3334/CDIAC/OTG.CLIVAR_33HQ20121005, 2014.

McPhee, M. G., Stanton, T. P., Morison, J. H. and Martinson, D. G.: Freshening of the upper ocean in the Arctic: is perennial sea ice disappearing? Geophys. Res. Lett. 25, 1729–1732, 1998.

Mecklenburg, S., Drusch, M., Kerr, Y. H., Font, J., Martín-Neira, M., Delwart, S., Buenadicha, G., Reul, N., Daganzo-Eusebio, E., Oliva, R., and Crapolicchio, R.: ESA's soil moisture and ocean salinity mission: Mission performance and operations. IEEE TGARS, 50(5), 1354–1366, DOI: 10.1109/TGRS.2012.2187666, 2012

Mignot, J., and Frankignoul, C.: On the interannual variability of surface salinity in the Atlantic. Climate Dynamics, 20(6), 555–565. doi:10.1007/s00382-002-0294-0, 2003

Formatted: Header

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Field Code Changed

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, English (US)

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, English (US)

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Morison, J., Kwok, R., Peralta-Ferriz, C., Alkire, M., Rigor, I., Andersen, R., and Steele, M.: Changing arctic ocean freshwater pathways. Nature, 481:66–70, 2012.

Olmedo, E., Gabarró, C., González-Gambau, V., Martínez, J., Ballabrera-Poy, J., Turiel, A., Portabella, M., Fournier, S., and Lee, T.: Seven Years of SMOS Sea Surface Salinity at High Latitudes: Variability in Arctic and Sub-Arctic Regions. *Remote Sensing*. 2018; 10(11):1772, https://doi.org/10.3390/rs10111772, 2018.

Reverdin, G., Cayan, D., and Kushnir, Y.: Decadal variability of hydrography in the upper northern North Atlantic in 1948–1990. J. Geophys. Res., 102, 8505–8531, https://doi.org/10.1029/96JC03943, 1997

Sakov, P., and Oke, P. R.: A deterministic formulation of the ensemble Kalman Filter: an alternative to ensemble square root filters. Tellus A, 60(2), 361-371, doi:10.1111/j.1600-0870.2007.00299.x, 2008.

Simmons, A., Uppala, S., Dee, D., and Kobayashi, S.: ERA-Interim: New ECMWF reanalysis products from 1989 onwards. ECMWF Newsletter. 110. 25-35, doi:10.21957/pocnex23c6, 2007.

SMOS Team, SMOS L2 OS Algorithm Theoretical Baseline Document, ESA, Paris, France, SO-TN-ARG-GS-0007, version 3.13, available from https://earth.esa.int/documents/10174/1854519/SMOS_L2OS-ATBD (last access: 12th December 2018), 29th April 2016.

SMOS-BEC Team, Quality Report: Validation of SMOS-BEC experimental sea surface salinity products in the Arctic Ocean and high latitudes Oceans. Years 2011-2013, Barcelona Expert Centre, Spain. Technical note: BEC-SMOS-0007-QR version 1.0, available at http://bec.icm.csic.es/doc/BEC-SMOS-0007-QR.pdf (last access: 13th December 2018), 4th March 2016.

Steele, M. and W. Ermold (2004) Salinity Trends on the East Siberian Shelves, Geophysical Research Letters, Vol. 31, L24308, doi:10.1029/2004GL021302, 2004.

Steele, M., R. Morley, and W. Ermold, PHC: A global ocean hydrography with a high-quality Arctic Ocean, Journal of Climate, 14, 2079-2087, 2001.

Sumner, D., and Belaineh, G.: Evaporation, Precipitation, and Associated Salinity Changes at a Humid, Subtropical Estuary. *Estuaries, 28*(6), 844-855. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3526951, 2005.

Supply A, Boutin J, Vergely J-L, et al.: Precipitation Estimates from SMOS Sea-Surface Salinity. *Q. J. R. Meteorol. Soc.*, 144 (Suppl. 1):103–119, https://doi.org/10.1002/qj.3110, 2018.

Talley, L. D., Johnson, G. C., Purkey, S., Feely, R. A., and Wanninkhof, R.: Global Ocean Ship-based Hydrographic Investigations Program (GO-SHIP) provides key climate-relevant deep ocean observations, US CLIVAR Variations, 15 (2), available from

Formatted: Header

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Deleted: Martínez, J., Umbert,

Moved down [5]: M.,

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Font color: Auto

Deleted: Hoareau, N., Portabella, M., Ballabrera-Poy, J., and Turiel, A.: Improving time and space resolution of SMOS salinity maps using multifractal fusion. Remote Sens. Environ. 180, 246–263, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2016.02.038, 2016.¶
Olmedo, E.,

Formatted: English (US)

Deleted: Oki, T. and Sud, Y. C.: Design of Total Runoff Integrating Pathways (TRIP)-A global river channel network, Earth Interact., 2, 1–37, doi:10.1175/1087-3562(1998)002<0001:DOTRIP>2.3.CO;2, 1998.¶

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

Field Code Changed

https://www.pmel.noaa.gov/pubs/PDF/tall4659/tall4659.pdf (last access: 19th December 2018), 2017.

Toole, J. M., Krishfield, R. A., Timmermans, M.-L., and Proshutinsky, A.: The Ice-Tethered Profiler: Argo of the Arctic, Oceanography, 24, 126–135, doi:10.5670/oceanog.2011.64, 2011.

Tseng, Y., Bryan, F. O., and Whitney, M. M.: Impacts of the representation of riverine freshwater input in the community earth system model. Ocean Modelling, 105, 71–86. doi:10.1016/j.ocemod.2016.08.002, 2016.

Uotila, P., Goosse, H., Haines, K., Chevallier, M., Barthélemy, A., Bricaud, C., Carton, J., Fu˘ckar, N., Garric, G., Iovino, D., Kauker, F., Korhonen, M., Lien, V. S., Marnela, M., Massonnet, F., Mignac, D., Peterson, A., Sadikn, R., Shi, L., Tietsche, S., Toyoda, T., Xie, J., and Zhang, Z.: An assessment of ten ocean reanalyses in the polar regions, Clim. Dynam.,https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-018-4242-z, online first, 2018.

Vancoppenolle, M., Fichefet, T., and Goosse, H.: Simulating the mass balance and salinity of Arctic and Antarctic sea ice. 2. Importance of sea ice salinity variations. Ocean Modelling, 27, 54–69. doi:10.1016/j.ocemod.2008.11.003, 2009.

Verbrugge, N., Mulet, S., Guinehut, S., Buongiorno Nardelli, B., and Droghei, R.: Quality information document for global ocean multi observation products multiobs_glo_phy_rep_015_002, CMEMS-MOB-QUID-015-002, v1.0, available from http://cmems-resources.cls.fr/documents/QUID/CMEMS-MOB-QUID-015-002.pdf (last access: 14th December 2018), February 2018.

Vialard, J., and P. Delecluse (1998), An OGCM study for the TOGA decade: I. Role of salinity in the physics of the Western Pacific fresh pool, J. Phys. Oceanogr., 28, 1071–1088.

Woodgate, R., Aagaard, K. and Weingartner, T.: Monthly temperature, salinity, and transport variability of the Bering Strait through flow. *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 32, L04601, DOI: 10.1029/2004GL021880, 2005.

Xie, J., Bertino, L., Counillon, F., Lisæter, K. A., and Sakov, P.: Quality assessment of the TOPAZ4 reanalysis in the Arctic over the period 1991–2013. *Ocean Science*, 13(1), 123–144. http://doi.org/10.5194/os-13-123-2017, 2017.

Xie, J., Counillon, F., and Bertino, L.: Impact of assimilating a merged sea-ice thickness from CryoSat-2 and SMOS in the Arctic reanalysis, The Cryosphere, 12, 3671-3691, https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-12-3671-2018, 2018.

Xie, J., Counillon, F., Bertino, L., Tian-Kunze, X., and Kaleschke, L.: Benefits of assimilating thin sea-ice thickness from SMOS into the TOPAZ system. *The Cryosphere*, 10, 2745–2761. http://doi.org/10.5194/tc-10-2745-2016, 2016.

Formatted: Header

Moved (insertion) [5]

Moved (insertion) [6]

Formatted: Font: 11 pt, Font color: Auto

Field Code Changed

Moved up [6]: L.,

Deleted: Vergely, J. -

Deleted: and Boutin, J.: SMOS OS Level 3: The Algorithm Theoretical Basis Document (v300), available on. http://www.catds.fr/content/download/78841/1005020/file/ATBD_L3OS_v3.0.pdf?version=3. (last access: 14th December 2018), 5th May 2017.¶

Formatted: Normal, Justified, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 0,75 cm

Formatted: English (US)

Yu, L.: A global relationship between the ocean water cycle and near-surface salinity, J. Geophys. Res., 116, C10025, doi:10.1029/2010JC006937, 2011.

Zweng, M. M., Reagan, J. R., Antonov J. I., Locarnini, R. A., Mishonov, A. V., Boyer, T. P., Garcia, H. E., Baranova, O. K., Johnson, D. R., Seidov, D., and Biddle, M. M.: World Ocean Atlas 2013, Volume 2: Salinity, Levitus, S. (Ed.), Mishonov, A., Technical Ed. NOAA Atlas NESDIS 74, 39pp, 2013.

Formatted: Header

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Page 1: [1] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Header

Page 2: [2] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 2: [3] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Justified

Page 2: [4] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 2: [4] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 2: [5] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [6] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [7] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [7] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [8] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Pattern: Clear

Page 2: [9] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 2: [10] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [11] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [12] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [13] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 2: [14] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [14] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [14] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [15] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [16] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [17] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 2: [18] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [19] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 2: [20] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [21] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 2: [22] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [23] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [23] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [24] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 2: [25] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [26] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 2: [27] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [28] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [29] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [30] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 2: [31] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [32] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 2: [33] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Text 1

Page 2: [34] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font: Bold

Page 2: [35] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Justified, Don't adjust right indent when grid is defined, Line spacing: single, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

Page 2: [36] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 4: [37] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [37] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [37] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [38] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [39] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [39] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [39] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [40] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [41] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 4: [41] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 4: [42] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [43] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [43] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [43] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [43] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [43] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [44] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [44] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [44] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [45] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [45] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [46] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [46] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [46] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [46] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 4: [46] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [47] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [47] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [47] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [47] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [47] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [47] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [47] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [47] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [47] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [48] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 5: [49] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [50] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [50] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [50] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [50] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [51] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [51] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 5: [51] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 7: [52] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 7: [53] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 7: [54] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 7: [55] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 7: [56] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 7: [57] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 7: [58] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 7: [59] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 8: [60] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 8: [61] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 8: [62] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 8: [63] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 8: [64] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [65] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [65] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [65] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [66] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 9: [67] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [67] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [67] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 9: [67] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 10: [68] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 10: [69] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 10: [70] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 11: [71] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

•

Page 13: [72] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [72] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [72] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [72] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [72] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [72] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [72] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [72] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [73] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Auto

Page 13: [73] Formatted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Font color: Auto

Page 13: [74] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [74] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [74] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [74] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [74] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [74] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted **Author** **6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [75] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**
Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 13: [76] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [77] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [77] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [77] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [77] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [77] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [77] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [77] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [77] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [78] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [79] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [80] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 14: [81] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 14: [81] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 14: [81] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 14: [81] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 14: [81] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [82] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [83] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [83] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [83] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [83] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [84] Formatted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 15: [84] Formatted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 15: [85] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [85] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [85] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [85] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 15: [85] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [85] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [86] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [86] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [86] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [86] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [87] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [87] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [87] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 15: [87] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 1: [88] Formatted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Header

Page 16: [89] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 16: [89] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 16: [89] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 16: [90] Deleted	**Author**	**6/15/19 3:21:00 AM**

Page 16: [90] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [90] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [91] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [91] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [91] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [92] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [93] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [93] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [94] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [95] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [96] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [96] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [97] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [98] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [99] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [100] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [101] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [102] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [103] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [104] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [105] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [106] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [107] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [107] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [108] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [109] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [110] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [110] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [111] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [112] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [113] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [114] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [115] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [115] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [115] Formatted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Font color: Text 1

Page 16: [116] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted	Author	6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Page 16: [116] Deleted Author 6/15/19 3:21:00 AM

Captions of Table and Figures:

Table 1. Details of the six products evaluated during 2011-2013.

Product	***Data source***	***Resolution***	***Provider***	***Website or CMEMS id***	***Release year***
BEC	SMOS	9 days; 25 km	Barcelona Expert Centre, Spain	http://bec.icm.csie.es	2018
CEC	SMOS	9 days; 25 km zonal	Ocean Salinity Expertise Center, IFREMER	FTP: ftp.ifremer.fr	2018
TP4	Reanalysis	Daily; 12~16 km	CMEMS	ARCTIC-REANALYSIS-PHYS-002-003	2015
MOB	In situ + SMOS	7 days; 1/4x1/4°;	CMEMS	MULTIOBS_GLO_PHY_REP_015_002	2016
PHC	In situ (1950-1994)	Monthly; 1x1°	*Polar Science Center, University of Washington*	http://psc.apl.washington.edu/	2005
WOA	In situ (1955~2012)	Monthly; 1/4x1/4°	*NODC, NOAA*	https://www.nodc.noaa.gov/OC5/woa13/	2013

Table 2. Misfits of SSS relative to in-situ CORA5.1 observations during 2011-2013 in each sub-region. Bold numbers denote the smallest error among the six products.

	Bias (psu)						RMSD (psu)					
Region	BEC	CEC	TP4	MOB	PHC	WOA	BEC	CEC	TP4	MOB	PHC	WOA
S0	-	-	.48	-.52	.48	***-.11***	-	-	1.25	1.78	1.28	***.70***
S1	4.03	3.18	3.29	1.63	3.29	***.42***	4.23	3.70	3.47	2.22	3.43	***1.37***
S2	-1.76	***-.44***	-.97	2.96	-3.30	-2.93	2.16	2.57	***1.70***	3.68	3.87	3.62
S3	***-.14***	-.70	***-.14***	-.21	-.29	-.25	.45	1.17	***.34***	.42	.51	.44
S4	-.09	-.20	.12	.11	***-.02***	***.02***	.91	1.21	.89	.86	.94	***.84***
S5	-.07	.06	.20	***.01***	.02	.07	1.47	1.52	1.42	1.44	1.39	***1.30***
S6	***-.01***	.15	***.01***	***-.01***	-.09	.05	.25	.66	.14	***.12***	.28	.16
S7	.05	.34	.04	***-.03***	-.23	***-.03***	.31	.88	.33	***.22***	.43	.27

Table 3. Optimal coefficients for the 4th order polynomial fit of the errors (see Eq. 3) as a function of in-situ SSS for each product.

Product	F(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, p_5, s)					Residual norm	In situ samples
	p_1(x10^{-3})	p_2	p_3	p_4	p_5		
BEC	0.168	-0.016	0.614	-11.345	87.097	7.03	91
CEC	0.225	-0.033	-1.550	-29.886	205.179	18.13	121
TP4	0.993	-0.096	3.430	-54.552	335.197	10.17	232
MOB	-1.080	0.128	-5.469	99.824	-645.087	68.81	163
PHC	1.257	-0.120	4.235	-65.938	388.808	13.98	232
WOA	-0.121	0.010	-0.322	3.998	-10.847	38.91	232

Formatted ... [1]
Moved (insertion) [1]
Formatted ... [2]
Deleted: the ...n-situ CORA5.1 observations from ... [3]
Deleted: ¶
Formatted ... [4]
Formatted Table ... [5]
Deleted: MOI
Deleted: MOI
Formatted ... [6]
Moved down [2]: -.97
Formatted ... [7]
Deleted: ***44***
Formatted ... [8]
Deleted: -1.12
Deleted: 38
Deleted: ***.52***
Formatted ... [9]
Deleted: 64
Formatted ... [11]
Deleted: 43
Deleted: 1.42
Formatted ... [10]
Formatted ... [12]
Deleted: 95
Deleted: 78
Deleted: 4.11
Formatted ... [14]
Deleted: 4.39
Deleted: 78
Moved (insertion) [3]
Deleted: .56
Deleted: 2.80
Formatted ... [13]
Deleted: 2.80
Deleted: -2.
Deleted: .75
Deleted: ***-.17***
Formatted ... [15]
Deleted: ***2.04***
Formatted ... [16]
Deleted: 42
Deleted: ***.65***
Formatted ... [17]
Moved (insertion) [2]
Deleted: .70
Deleted: -....74 ... [18]
Deleted: 1.77
Moved up [3]: ***1.37***
Formatted ... [19]
Deleted: ***1.81***
Formatted ... [20]
Deleted: 15
Deleted: 2.41
Formatted ... [21]
Deleted: 87
Deleted: 2.90
Formatted ... [22]
Deleted: 2.71
Deleted: ***.05***
Formatted ... [23]
Deleted: 15



Fig. 1 **(a)**: SSS locations of the in-situ observations north of 52°N in CORA5.1 during the years 2011-2013. 8 sub-regions divide the Arctic Ocean, with the number of observations indicated in each region. **(b)**: Independent SSS observations in the Beaufort Sea during the summer months of 2011-2013 from the BGEP (marked by anti-triangles, squares, and starts) and the CLIVAR (marked by triangles and crosses). Different colors (red, black and yellow) indicate the years (2011, 2012 and 2013 resp.).



Fig. 2 Monthly SSS (unit: psu) in March from satellite products (BEC and CEC, *left column*), reanalysis/reprocessing (TP4 and MOB, *middle column*), and climatology (PHC and WOA, *right column*). White areas are masked by sea ice. The thick brown line represents the sea ice edge (15% concentration from TP4), and the black shaded isoline represents the 35 psu salinity near the surface.



Deleted: ... [61]

Deleted: of

Deleted: They are divided into

Deleted: around

Deleted: and

Deleted: are marked on the panel.

Deleted: . They are collected

Deleted:) respectively, and with different color in which the ...

Deleted: (

Deleted: or

Deleted: denotes

Deleted: observations in

Deleted: (

Deleted: or

Deleted:).

Deleted: ¶
¶ ... [62]

Deleted: reanalyzes

Deleted: MOI

Deleted: extent

Deleted: TOPAZ4

Deleted: of 35 psu



Fig. 3 Similar to previous figure in September.



Fig. 4 Deviations of monthly SSS (unit: psu) in August for (a) BEC; (b) PHC; (c) CEC; (d) MOB; and (e) WOA relative to TP4. The thick brown line represents sea ice edge (15% concentration from TP4), the black lines represent ±1 psu.

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶



Fig. 3 Monthly mean of SSS (unit: psu) in September from satellite products (BEC and CEC, *left column*), reanalyzes (TP4 and MOI, *middle column*), and climatology (PHC and WOA, *right column*), other same as Fig. 2.¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
... [63]

Deleted: the 5 products of

Deleted: MOI

Deleted: extent

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0 cm



Fig. 5 Same as previous for September.



Fig. 6 Monthly deviations in the Arctic Ocean (>60N) of (a) the RMS and (b) the spatial average during the period 2011-2013 for the five SSS products referred to TP4. The anti-triangle (triangle, circle, star and square) line represents the SSS deviations from BEC (CEC, MOB, PHC and WOA respectively).

Deleted: ¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶



Moved down [4]: Fig.

Deleted: 5 Deviations of month SSS (unit: psu) in September for the 5 products of (a) BEC; (b) PHC; (c) CEC; (d) MOI; and (e) WOA relative to TP4. The thick brown line represents sea ice extent (15% concentration from TP4), the black lines represent ±1 psu.¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
... [64]

Moved down [5]: ¶
Fig.

Moved (insertion) [4]

Deleted: RMSD (upper) and mean (bottom)

Deleted: of monthly mean SSS (unit: psu) relative to TP4

Deleted: 60°N) for the

Deleted: of

Deleted: .

Deleted: denotes

Deleted: MOI

Deleted:)

Deleted: .

Formatted: Normal, Indent: Left: 0 cm



Fig. 7 Scatterplots of SSS compared to the CORA5.1 in-situ observations with respect to the S0-S3 regions in the Arctic. The diamonds (anti-triangles, stars, squares, circles, and triangles) represents the SSS from TP4 (BEC, PHC, WOA, MOB, and CEC respectively). The black (red) lines are the linear regressions of the blue (purple) dots in each panel, and the coefficient R^2 is indicated in the panel together with the number of observations in parentheses.

Moved (insertion) [5]

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0,75 cm, Right: -1,01 cm

Deleted: ----------------------------------Page Break----------------------------------



Fig. 7



Fig. 8 Same as Fig. 7 but for the subpolar regions S4-S7.



Fig. 9 The mean deviation of SSS for the six datasets compared to in situ observations from CORA 5.1 during the three years of 2011-2013 in the northern North Atlantic and the Nordic seas. The SSS observations are distributed into the coarse grid cells of 9x9 grids in TP4, with a gray mask if the valid observations less than 10.

Formatted: Left



Fig. 10 The Root Mean Square deviation of SSS for six datasets compared to in situ observations from CORA 5.1 during the three years of 2011-2013 in the northern North Atlantic and the Nordic seas. The SSS observations are distributed into the coarse grid cells of 9x9 grids in TP4, with a gray mask if the valid observations less than 10.

Deleted:



Deleted: 8



Fig. 11 Scatterplots of SSS compared to the in-situ observations in Beaufort Sea during the summer months of 2011-2013; (a) The diamond (anti-triangle) represents the SSS from TP4 (BEC) with blue (purple), and the linear regression is denoted by the dashed black (red) line. (b) The star (square) from the climatology of PHC (WOA). (c) The circle (triangle) represents from MOB (CEC). The coefficient R^2 is the squared linear relationship, and the misfits also shown on the panels.



Fig. 12 Scatterplots of SSS uncertainty compared to the in-situ observations in Beaufort Sea as a function of the observed salinity. The black dashed line represents the absolute deviation of 5 psu. (a) The diamond (anti-triangle) represents from TP4 (BEC) with blue (purple). (b) The star (square) from the climatology of PHC (WOA). (c) The circle (triangle) represents from MOB (CEC). The thick dashed curves are fitted by the fourth order polynomial function, and the norm residuals are marked on panel respectively.



Deleted:

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0,25 cm

Deleted: 9

Deleted: . Left:

Deleted: blue(pink

Deleted: Middle:

Deleted: Right: the

Deleted: MOI

Deleted: mean/RMS deviation



Deleted:

Deleted: 10

Deleted: 3

Deleted: Left:

Deleted: Middle:

Deleted: Right: the

Deleted: MOI

Page 24: [1] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: Arial

Page 24: [2] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: Not Bold

Page 24: [3] Deleted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**
Page 24: [3] Deleted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**
Page 24: [3] Deleted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**
Page 24: [3] Deleted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**
Page 24: [3] Deleted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**
Page 24: [3] Deleted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**
Page 24: [4] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: 10,5 pt

Page 24: [5] Formatted Table	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Formatted Table

Page 24: [6] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Centered

Page 24: [7] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [8] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [9] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [10] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [11] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [12] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background), Highlight

Page 24: [13] Formatted	**Jiping Xie**	**6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Left

Page 24: [14] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [15] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background), Highlight

Page 24: [16] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background), Highlight

Page 24: [17] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold

Page 24: [18] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [18] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [19] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background), Highlight

Page 24: [20] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [21] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [22] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Left

Page 24: [23] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [24] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [25] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [26] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [27] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [28] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [29] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [30] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [31] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [32] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Left

Page 24: [33] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [34] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [35] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [36] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [37] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [38] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [39] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [40] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [41] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Left, Tab stops: 0,31 cm, Centered

Page 24: [42] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [43] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [44] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [45] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [46] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [47] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

Page 24: [48] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [49] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Bold, Italic, Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [50] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [51] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [52] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Pattern: 15% (Auto Foreground, White Background)

Page 24: [53] Formatted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Font: Not Bold

Page 24: [54] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [54] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [54] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [54] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [55] Formatted Table	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Formatted Table

Page 24: [56] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [57] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [58] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [58] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [59] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [59] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [60] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 24: [60] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 25: [61] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 25: [62] Deleted	Jiping Xie	6/15/19 3:27:00 AM

Page 26: [63] Deleted **Jiping Xie** **6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**

Page 27: [64] Deleted **Jiping Xie** **6/15/19 3:27:00 AM**