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Abstract

We use measurements of ocean surface dissolved Al, a global Biogeochemical Elemental Cycling (BEC) ocean model, and the global Dust Entrainment and Deposition (DEAD) model, to constrain dust deposition to the oceans. Our Al database contains all available measurements with best coverage in the Atlantic. Vertical profiles and seasonal data exist in limited regions. Observations show that surface dissolved Al is distributed similarly to the dust deposition predicted by DEAD and other models. There is an Equatorial Atlantic Al maximum that decreases toward higher latitudes. There are high Al concentrations in the Mediterranean Sea and the Arabian Sea and low concentrations in the Pacific and the Southern Ocean. The ocean basins maintain more distinct Al profiles than Fe profiles in the upper ocean, consistent with a weaker biological influence on Al than Fe. The BEC-predicted surface dissolved Al compares well with observations. The Al distribution reflects the combined effects of Al input from dust and Al removal by particle scavenging and biological uptake by diatoms. Model-observed biases suggest a southward shift of maximum dust deposition compared to current dust model predictions. DEAD appears to overestimate deposition north of 30°N in the Pacific, and to underestimate deposition south of 30°N. Observed Al concentrations and the ocean model-predicted surface Al lifetime provide a semi-independent method to estimate oceanic dust deposition. This technique indicates that DEAD may overestimate dust deposition at the north equatorial Atlantic but underestimate in other Atlantic regions, the Southern Ocean and the Arabian Sea. Our results have implications for all dust-borne ocean nutrients including Fe and demonstrate the potential of marine geochemical data to constrain atmospheric aerosol deposition fields.

1 Introduction

Atmospheric aerosols deliver terrestrial elements essential to the ocean ecosystem and ocean biogeochemical cycles and thus have an important impact on the global carbon cycle. Aerosol-borne nutrients that can limit the growth of phytoplankton include nitrate, ammonium, phosphate, silicate and iron. Iron deficiency limits the primary production in High Nutrient Low Chlorophyll (HNLC) ocean areas [Martin and Fitzwater, 1988] and
most iron in the remote ocean comes from mineral dust deposition [Fung et al., 2000]. Unfortunately aerosol deposition to the surface ocean is poorly quantified due to sparse measurements [Prospero, 1996]. Dissolved Al provides an independent estimate for atmospheric mineral dust aerosol deposition [Measures and Brown, 1996; Gehlen et al., 2003]. Direct measurements of oceanic Al or dust deposition are only available at a handful of remote islands for limited time periods [Duce et al., 1991; Prospero, 1996; Ginoux et al., 2001]. Estimates of ocean nutrient deposition are extrapolated from these observations or predicted by atmospheric models which have been evaluated against available concentration and optical depth data [Andersen et al., 1998; Mahowald et al., 1999; Ginoux et al., 2001; Zender et al., 2003]. The inter-model uncertainty in global deposition estimates is at least a factor of four [Zender et al., 2004]. Deposition uncertainty propagates into uncertainties in oceanic iron availability and in atmospheric aerosol direct and indirect radiative forcing. To better understand the role of aerosol deposition on ocean biogeochemistry and the global carbon cycle, dust input to the ocean must be better constrained.

Aluminum is an ideal tracer for quantifying the dust deposition to the surface ocean due to its geochemical characteristics. First, Al is a major and relatively invariant component of continental materials [Wedepohl, 1995]. Al is the third most common element in continental materials accounting for about 8% of crustal mass. Second, the residence time of Al in the surface ocean is relatively short (~ 6.5yr) [Jickells et al., 1994] which impedes transfer from the coastal areas to the open oceans. That means the atmospheric input is the main source for the surface ocean Al concentration in the remote oceans. Third, ocean Al chemistry is relatively simple compared to Fe because Al is not involved in complicated redox chemistry.

The concentrations and distributions of trace metals in the ocean are controlled by processes including external input, removal, and internal cycling. It is likely that Al cycles in a manner similar to Fe in the oceans [Bruland and Lohan, 2003]. The most important source for iron and aluminum is partial dissolution from dust deposition. Al solubility estimates range widely from 0.5–86% with a mean of about 5% [Prospero et al., 1987; Sato, 2003; Baker et al., 2006]. Removal processes include active biological uptake by diatoms and passive scavenging onto particles. The removal rate is first-order dependent on the particle concentration [Moran et al., 1992]. There is some active uptake and incorporation into the frustules by diatoms [Gehlen et al., 2002]. According to the few deposition observations available, the dissolved Al distribution seems well correlated to the oceanic dust flux [Measures and Vink, 2000]. Typical surface Al concentrations range from 50 to 0.1 nM for high dust area and low dust area respectively [Measures and Vink, 2000]. Measures and Vink [2000] used a simple model named MADCOW to invert observed Al concentrations to dust deposition fluxes. MADCOW assumes that dissolved Al is in steady state, that surface Al originates only from partial dissolution of deposited mineral dust, and that the Al loss occurs solely from biological particle scavenging. In addition, a constant mixed layer depth and residence time for dissolved Al is assumed. With these assumptions, Al scavenging balances the partial dissolution of deposited Al. MADCOW-inferred dust deposition from surface Al concentrations agrees fairly [Measures and Vink, 2000] with observations [Duce et al., 1991] over four
orders of magnitude [Measures and Vink, 2000].

Gehlen et al. [2003] assembled a database for dissolved Al concentrations in oceanic water and used a geochemical ocean general circulation model coupled with the geochemical cycles of Al and Si to study the relationship between surface Al and total dust input. They provided an empirically corrected parameterization of the partition coefficient for Al removal by biogenic opal and they left the Al scavenging rate a free parameter. Their ocean model calculated Al concentration in the surface ocean from two different modeled dust deposition fields [Andersen et al., 1998; Mahowald et al., 1999]. They obtained the best fit between predicted and measured Al concentrations using an Al solubility of 1.5%–3.0%. Their work demonstrates how ocean observations may be used to evaluate atmospheric model estimates of mineral aerosol deposition. The many uncertainties involved in inferring dust deposition from Al measurements include the choice of scavenging parameters, Al solubility, and the surface ocean biology, which itself through Fe addition may depend on dust deposition.

We use an augmented Al observational database that is used to characterize, evaluate, and improve our understanding of ocean Al cycling as represented in a state-of-the-art ocean ecosystem-biogeochemical model. We have assembled all known, relevant oceanic dissolved Al observations into a single database. The database includes eighteen more cruise tracks and stations and approximately three times as much data (10,460 points) as previous studies [Gehlen et al., 2003]. The newer data significantly improves the characterization of the North Pacific and Southern Ocean Al cycle. Second, we develop a more realistic and complete prognostic global ocean Al cycle model which agrees well overall with the measurements. The model provides new insights on the timescale, solubility, and basin distributions of Al that are most consistent with measurements.

2 Methods

2.1 Database of dissolved Al observations

The concentration of dissolved Al in the oceans has been measured during approximately forty cruises and stations since 1976. Our augmented database includes virtually all Al data published since 1979, as well as unpublished data from Measures and Hydes (Table 1). There are 10460 data points in all.

Gehlen et al. [2003] collated data from 12 cruises and stations. These and the 18 newer cruise tracks are plotted in Figure 1. Much more data will become available in the near future through sampling on cruises associated with the CLIVAR and GEOTRACES programs. These data will include observations from the cruise tracks across the Pacific and the Indian Oceans and they will help to fill large data gaps in these ocean regions. At the global ocean scale, most regions are still poorly observed. The Atlantic coverage is best, especially the equatorial Atlantic, where dust input is high due to emissions from North African deserts. Most measurements are limited to the surface ocean and only 20% of data are beneath 100 m. There are several transects across the North Pacific. Some data
are available in the HNLC (high nutrient, low chlorophyll) region of the Southern Ocean and around Southeast Asia. In limited regions, e.g. the Hawaii Ocean Time-series (HOT), Bermuda Atlantic Time-series (BATS), Arabian Sea, the data are sufficient to describe the seasonal variability.

The original batch fluorimetric method for measuring Al using the reagent Lumogallion was developed by Hydes and Liss [1976]. This method has a detection limit of 2 nM of aluminum and has been used in the relatively high concentration region of the Atlantic Ocean. The Flow Injection Analysis (FIA) version of this chemistry has a detection limit of 0.6 nM and has been used in various ocean basins. Methods that can be used on even lower values were applied successfully after that: the method using atomic absorption achieved the best detection limits of 0.1 nM [Orians and Bruland, 1986] and the gas chromatography method can be used at levels between 0.6 and 120 nM [Measures and Edmond, 1989]. There is no apparent discrepancy among these methods [Orians and Bruland, 1986; Measures et al., 1986].

Most of the data in Table 1 were obtained from filtered samples, some though were from unfiltered samples. However, the dissolution of particulate Al is negligible if the storage time is minimal and the samples are not acidified [Measures et al., 1986]. Also, the unfiltered data are consistent with those filtered [Bowie et al., 2002].

2.2 Global Biogeochemical Model

In this study, we incorporated ocean Al cycling in the Biogeochemical Elemental Cycling (BEC) ocean model [Moore et al., 2004]. The BEC ocean model couples the upper ocean ecosystem model [Moore et al., 2002] and an expanded biogeochemistry module [Doney et al., 2003] with the ocean circulation component of the Community Climate System Model 3.0 [Collins et al., 2006]. This marine ecosystem model includes one zooplankton and four phytoplankton functional groups: coccolithophores, small phytoplankton, diatoms, and diazotrophs; key limiting nutrients: nitrate, ammonium, phosphate, iron, and silicate; sinking particulates and dissolved organic matter. In these components, the model tracks carbon, nitrogen, phosphorus, iron, silicon, oxygen and calcium carbonate and then predicts the biomass, productivity, community structure, and carbon export in the ocean ecosystem.

This coupled model accurately predicts the HNLC regions in the Southern Ocean and subarctic Pacific Ocean, except for a larger spatial extent of HNLC conditions in the equatorial Pacific region, which is a common problem in coarse resolution models [Moore et al., 2004]. It also reproduces known basin-scale patterns of primary production, export productions and macronutrient concentrations. The BEC model realistically simulates the biogenic silica production as well as the ocean circulation (e.g., mixed layer depth, element transport) which helps us determine dust deposition from dissolved Al. Sensitivity tests indicate that the model response to variations in atmospheric dust input is realistic compared to field experiments [Moore et al., 2004, 2006; Krishnamurthy et al., submitted to Journal of Marine Systems]. This indicates that this model is appropriate for studying the
relationship between atmospheric dust input and ocean Al concentration. The BEC model employed here includes some parameter modifications described by Krishnamurthy et al. (submitted, manuscript available at http://www.ess.uci.edu/jkmoore/).

We incorporated a dissolved Al tracer in the BEC model largely following the parameterizations developed for iron. Partial dissolution of deposited dust provides Al to the ocean and particle scavenging removes it. For our standard simulation we assume a constant Al/dust weight ratio of 8% and a constant solubility for the Al of 5%. We include a sensitivity experiment to indicate how this assumed solubility impacts our results. Other processes simulated in the Al cycle include biological uptake by diatoms, remineralization, and advection and mixing, due to ocean physics. The diatom Al/Si uptake ratio is a function of ambient Al and Si concentrations, based on the relationship found by Gehlen et al. [2002] (see appendix for details). Following the ballast mineral model which relates the ballast mineral flux to the POC flux [Armstrong et al., 2002], our model ties Al remineralization to the POC remineralization, which is a good proxy for the total sinking particle flux in the model. According to the ballast mineral model, there are two kinds of sinking particles: easily remineralized and hardly remineralized, which refer to the soft and hard fluxes described by Armstrong et al. [2002]. The full model details and the parameterizations for the control run are given in the appendix.

The Dust Entrainment And Deposition (DEAD) model [Zender et al., 2003] provides the dust deposition input field for the BEC model. The DEAD model simulates size dependent dust processes including mobilization, transport, and dry and wet deposition for particles size from 0.1–10 $\mu$m which includes most long-range transported dust. The predicted and observed climatological mean dust deposition flux are compared at 6 oceanic stations, including Oahu [Zender et al., 2003] which is near HOT. The predictions of DEAD for LGM, pre-industrial, current, and doubled CO2 climates are evaluated against available observations in Mahowald et al. [2006]. Here we use the monthly mean dust deposition field obtained from driving DEAD with 1990s observed meteorology [Zender et al., 2003].

3 Results

3.1 Observed Al Climatology

The observed Al concentrations show clear regional trends with depth at the basin scale (Figure 2a). The highest and next highest Al concentrations are in the Mediterranean Sea and Atlantic Ocean, respectively. Interestingly, the Al concentration near the bottom of the Mediterranean Sea decreases sharply. The Al concentration below the brine interface drops by an order of magnitude and is similar to the observations in the North Atlantic. These data are reported by Hydes et al. [1988] who think the clay mineral formation process may explain this low Al concentration in the Southern Ocean and the Pacific Ocean have very low Al concentrations. The mean sub-surface ocean (150–500 m) and surface ocean (0–50 m) concentrations are tabulated by basin in Table 2. The Al profiles in each basin are
very similar throughout the water column except in the Mediterranean (Figure 2b), vary similarly to the input dust flux from DEAD model simulations. There is a strong correlation between mean DEAD simulated dust deposition and observed mean Al concentrations at the basin scale ($r^2$ of 0.93 for surface Al and 0.88 for subsurface Al). The consistency of the profiles of Al with depth (Figure 2) and the correlation with estimated dust inputs (Table 2) suggest that dissolved Al is a good proxy for dust deposition.

The surface layer (0–50 m) Al data are averaged onto the global model grid (Figure 3a). Data are averaged unweighted where there are multiple points in one grid cell. The distribution of surface dissolved Al is very similar to the distribution of modeled dust deposition with a maximum in the equatorial Atlantic, decreasing to higher latitudes. There are high concentrations in the Mediterranean and Arabian Seas, and low concentrations in the Pacific and Southern Oceans. We reversed the MADCOW model [Measures and Vink, 2000] to use the dust deposition field from the DEAD model [Zender et al., 2003] to predict the surface Al concentration (Figure 3b). Since MADCOW relates the dust deposition flux to surface ocean Al concentration by assuming a steady state, a constant Al residence time, a fixed mixed layer depth, and no advection, we can invert MADCOW to estimate Al concentration from the model predicted dust deposition field. The estimated Al correlates well with the observations although there are significant regional biases (Figure 4a). The inferred Al concentration is systematically too high in the Pacific and in the Arabian Sea, and too low in the South Atlantic. As shown below, our more realistic model with dynamic mixed layer depths and variable Al residence times, significantly reduces these biases.

### 3.2 Comparison of Observed Al Distributions with the BEC Simulation

The BEC model predicts the dissolved Al distribution that results from the prescribed Al input (via dust) from the DEAD model and removal by prognostic ocean circulation and ecosystem dynamics and particle scavenging. The resulting BEC-predicted surface Al distribution agrees well with observations (Figure 5, Figures 4b) and captures the equatorial Atlantic maximum, with lower concentrations in the Pacific and Southern oceans. The BEC-predicted Al concentrations averaged by basins compare well with the observations at both the surface and the sub-surface ocean (Table 2). In this paper, for the sake of constraining dust deposition, we focus mainly on surface and upper ocean Al and inferred dust budgets rather than deep ocean Al. The combined models produce large differences in some regions (Figure 5). The predicted maximum at the North Atlantic is too far north (Figure 5). Biological production and export are underestimated by the model in the Sargasso Sea [Moore et al., 2004]. Thus, the production of particles and scavenging of Al may also be underestimated in this region. The model tends to overestimate Al north of 30 °N in the Pacific and to underestimate Al south of it. These biases may arise several ways: (1) the BEC model itself, including the parameterization of production, remineralization and perhaps more importantly scavenging. (2) the input dust field, which we intend to constrain; (3) the geographic variation of Al concentration in the upper soil; and (4) the
Al solubility in the atmospheric aerosols. Sampling biases in the Al data cannot be ruled out. In most regions we are forced to compare climatological mean model predictions to Al data sampled at a particular location on a single day.

The BEC-DEAD model Al predictions are significantly improved relative to MADCOW-DEAD predictions (compare Figures 4a and 4b). Most BEC-DEAD predictions are within a factor of two of observations. The root mean square difference (rmsd, after logarithm transformation) is reduced by 38%. The regional biases in the Pacific Ocean, the Arabian Sea and South Atlantic Ocean have also been greatly reduced. Relative to MADCOW, the BEC model predicts longer residence times in the South Atlantic and shorter residence times in the Arabian Sea. This variable Al residence time explains the improved results in these regions. Remaining biases include overestimates in the north Atlantic and underestimations in the South Atlantic. These biases are most likely due to errors in either dust inputs or our assumed solubility.

Our ocean biogeochemistry ecosystem model and Al cycle are more complex than MADCOW [Measures and Vink, 2000] and the model of Gehlen et al. [2002]. The latter couples Al to biogenic opal with a first order scavenging coefficient while our model represents this biological activity, scavenging, and remineralization which depend on the mass of all sinking particles (mineral dust, organic matter, biogenic silica, and calcium carbonate). This study and Gehlen et al. [2002] simulate realistic surface Al distributions using different dust inputs. However the vertical profiles are very different. The observed vertical profiles often have a surface maximum, a subsurface minimum, and then gradually increase with depth down to the ocean floor. Gehlen et al. [2002] simulate profiles with Al concentration that generally increases with depth. Our alternate approach to the scavenging and internal ocean cycling of Al tends to reproduce the observed subsurface minimum often seen in the observations (Figure S3). Considering the good surface agreement, these inter-model differences are more likely caused by physical and biological processes than by differences in the inputs from dust. Our model does lead to excessively high dissolved Al values at the ocean floor (bottom cell on the model grid) because all Al sinking on particles is remineralized at the bottom. In reality, much of this Al is likely incorporated into the sediments.

3.3 Estimated Residence time

The residence time of surface ocean dissolved Al is the ratio of total surface layer Al to the rate of input or removal. In this case, we use the sum of Al from dissolved dust plus sources due to advection and mixing as the input rate for the upper 50 m. BEC predicts surface Al residence times ranging from months to 73 years (Figure 6), consistent with previous estimates [Orians and Bruland, 1986; Maring and Duce, 1987; Moran et al., 1992; Gehlen et al., 2003]. Short residence times occur in high dust areas (e.g. the equatorial Atlantic) and areas with relatively high biological activity (e.g. the equatorial Pacific). Long residence times are associated with low dust input and low biological activity as occurs in polar regions and mid-latitude gyres (where there are fewer particles available to scavenge...
The long residence times in some polar regions may be unrealistically high since the model includes no biological activity under the sea ice, thus no biological particles are available to scavenge Al in permanently ice-covered areas. In reality there is some biological production of particles within and just below the sea ice, and there also may be particles released from ice-rafted debris accumulated on or near the continent. The wide variation in residence times indicates that the BEC model could improve Al predictions (e.g., from MADCOW) by allow the residence time to vary. The mean Al residence time of the surface ocean (0–50 m) and the whole ocean are 2.3 and 53 years, respectively.

Particle scavenging and biological uptake by diatoms are the only Al removal processes. In our model, surface Al scavenging dominates the removal processes over more than 75% of the surface ocean. In the North Atlantic the model predicted scavenging can be 1000 times more efficient than uptake. Biological uptake significantly exceeds scavenging where silica production is high and dust flux is low, e.g., the equatorial Pacific. In this region, Dymond et al. [1997] found that essentially all of the sinking particulate Al was correlated with sinking opal. This suggests a dominant role for diatoms in Al removal in this region. Such regions account for < 10% of the surface ocean. In other regions, scavenging and biological uptake are of similar magnitude. Globally biological uptake accounts for 30% of dissolved Al removal from the upper 50m, but particle scavenging is the only removal term below the euphotic zone.

### 3.4 Time Series

The only sites where seasonal cycle data exist for multiple years are HOT (station ALOHA, 22°45’N, 158°W) and BATS (Hydrostation S, 32°10’N, 64°30’W). The predicted Al seasonal cycle amplitude is weaker than observed at BATS and essentially non-existent at HOT, although the dust deposition varies significantly with season at both sites (Figure 7). The modeled and observed Al concentrations at BATS show similar trends, and both lag the local dust deposition peak by about two months.

Johnson et al. [2003] measured a surface Al concentration of 3nM lower than the Hawaii Ocean Time-series measurements plotted in Figure 7, and even these low end observations are much higher than the BEC predicted Al concentrations at HOT. Johnson et al. [2003] also found the inconsistency between the surface water aluminum and iron and the expected aerosol concentrations. They suggested a combined effect of higher solubility and higher aerosol scavenging rates (higher dust deposition rate) than generally assumed. Air mass back-trajectories indicate that the air over HOT often originates from within the Asian dust plume that crosses the North Pacific at higher latitudes. Thus, dust deposition may be higher than predicted [Boyle et al., 2005]. Higher than model predicted dust deposition near HOT are also sometimes observed [McNaughton et al., 2006; Buck et al., 2006]. In the observations the region around Hawaii stands out with elevated Al concentrations relative to waters to the east and west (Figure 5). Experiment solubility data suggest that our assumed 5% solubility is fairly applicable at HOT [Sato, 2003; Buck et al., 2006]. This suggests that 10 times more than model predicted dust deposition at HOT is necessary if
we keep this same solubility, while the observed dust deposition flux at Oahu shows that DEAD underestimates dust deposition by only a factor of 2 [Zender et al., 2003]. This discrepancy remains unresolved.

### 3.5 BEC Model-Data Inferred Dust Deposition (Improved MADCOW Approach)

If we assume dissolved Al is in steady state, then the observed Al concentration (Figure 3a), modeled mixed layer depth (not shown) and modeled surface Al residence time (Figure 6) define an inferred dust deposition (Figure 8a). This method applies the MADCOW model but relaxes the assumptions of constant mixed layer depth and residence time. The deposition inferred from observed Al is only semi-independent of the modeled dust deposition since the Al residence time is derived from the BEC model which uses the DEAD modeled dust deposition. Recall the solubility and Al:dust weight ratio were assumed to be 5% and 8%, respectively. The inferred dust deposition shows that the current DEAD model has overestimated dust deposition at the north equatorial Atlantic but underestimated in other Atlantic regions, the Southern Ocean and the Arabian Sea. However, since the Al residence time is sensitive to the assumed Al solubility (see following section), solubility may also contribute to the mismatch between the inferred dust and DEAD simulated deposition.

### 4 Discussion

Though we have greatly expanded the Al database, the spatial coverage is still not enough to fully understand the global Al climatology. Some regions, such as the eastern Atlantic, have sufficient data for detailed comparisons with the model. The temporal coverage is even poorer. We have only one or two months data at most measurement locations. These few data determine the annual mean for purposes of model comparison. Since dust input to the surface ocean is highly episodic, the lack of temporal coverage might bias the derived annual mean values. At HOT and BATS, this bias can exceed 30% of the annual means based on the observed seasonality (Figure 7). Inter-annual dust deposition variability could also exceed 30% based on the observations at these sites. For regions with a longer Al residence time than HOT and BATS, this bias is acceptable, while for regions with shorter Al residence time, the bias would be larger. Also, we do not know the atmospheric conditions when the observation sample were taken. If there were a big dust event just before the ship track went by, the biases could be even larger. However, the observations display a regional coherence, with similar Al values, suggesting there were no such huge biases. The number of Al observations worldwide will increase dramatically in the coming decade due to new field campaigns, especially the basin transects associated with the CLIVAR and GEOTRACES programs.

Though the model generally agrees well with the observations, there are still large discrepancies in some regions. These discrepancies could be explained by either an unrealistic
input dust flux or the model parameters we choose. While the Al:dust ratio is relatively in-
variable, Al solubility ranges widely from 0.5% to 86% with a mean near 5% [Prospero
et al., 1987; Sato, 2003; Baker et al., 2006]. Gehlen et al. [2003] estimate mean Al solub-
ility is 1.5 to 3% based on numerical experiment with varying solubility to minimize model
measurement discrepancies. Our control run used a global uniform solubility of 5%.

To investigate the model sensitivity to the model parameterizations, we first repeated
the last 72 years of the control run with the same scavenging ratio but cutting the solubility
by half. Comparing the Al concentrations between the control run and the sensitivity run,
the model is highly sensitive to the solubility (Table 3). With the solubility reduced by
50%, the low solubility run corrected the overestimation in the Equatorial Atlantic region
(0–25 °N, 0–40 °W) where the dust deposition is very high. However, all the other regions
including other Atlantic areas, the Pacific and the Southern ocean were underestimated by
the low solubility run. This result is consistent with recent findings that the solubility of
Al from Saharan dust (median value 3.0%) is significantly lower than Al solubility from
non-Saharan source regions (median value 9.0%) [Baker et al., 2006] measurements and
theoretical considerations also suggest that solubility will vary regionally [Prospero et al.,
1987; Sato, 2003; Baker et al., 2006] and as a function of air mass history and chemical
transformation [Luo et al., 2005].

We then repeated the last 40 years of the control run with the same solubility but chang-
ing the base scavenging rate by ±10%. Comparing the Al concentrations again between
the control run and the sensitivity runs, the model is not overly sensitive to the chosen scav-
enging rate. Our base scavenging rate was chosen to minimize the model-data differences.
Additional field observations in coming years will further constrain this Al removal term.

The observed Al concentrations show clear basin scale difference and indicate that Al is
a good tracer for estimating dust deposition. We have improved the Al predictions and dust
deposition estimations by using a global BEC model with dynamic mixed layer depth and
Al residence time. The sensitivity test shows that the model is quite sensitive to Al solubil-
ity. The spatial variation of Al solubility is an important reason for the model observation
discrepancy and should be resolved in future research. Future simulations could include a
spatially varying solubility based on source region and aerosol composition, aerosol size
distributions, and/or distance from the source region. Observations of aerosol Al and Fe
solubility are also being made on the CLIVAR cruises and will help constrain the solubility
in the future. Remaining model-data discrepancies can then be attributed mainly to errors
in the simulated dust deposition.

References

Andersen, K. K., A. Armengaud, and C. Genthon (1998), Atmospheric dust under glacial


Bruland, K. W., and M. C. Lohan (2003), Controls of trace metals in seawater, in *Treatise on Geochemistry*, Elsevier Ltd.


Sato, T. (2003), The fractional solubility of aluminum from atmospheric aerosols, Master’s thesis, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, USA.


Appendices

A  Al Model Description

We added dissolved Al as a tracer to BEC following the parameterization for iron (Moore et al., in prep.). The only Al source to the ocean is partial dissolution from dust deposition and the only loss from the ocean is scavenging. For the whole ocean together:

\[
\frac{d[\text{Al}_{\text{diss}}]}{dt} = \text{DISS} - \text{SCAV} \times r
\]

where \([\text{Al}_{\text{diss}}]\) is dissolved Al concentration (mmol m\(^{-3}\)), DISS is partial dissolution of Al from dust deposition (mmol m\(^{-3}\) s\(^{-1}\)), SCAV is scavenging of Al (mmol m\(^{-3}\) s\(^{-1}\)), and \(r\) is fraction of scavenged Al assumed lost to ocean sediments, currently 20%.

Al reaches the deep ocean in sinking dust, by remineralization of production and previous scavenging, and by circulation and mixing. For each layer,

\[
\frac{d[\text{Al}_{\text{diss}}]}{dt} = \text{DISS} + \text{REMIN} + \text{CIRC} \times \text{PROD} - \text{SCAV}
\]

where REMIN is Al released from remineralization from PROD and part of SCAV(80%), CIRC is Al transported by circulation and mixing, and PROD is bio-uptake Al.

The dust deposition field can be from any observations or model predictions. Currently we use 1990s dust climatology from the DEAD model [Zender et al., 2003]. Deposited dust at the surface partially dissolves immediately into the mixed layer:

\[
\text{DISS} = S \times (r_{\text{Al}} \times F_{d0})
\]

where \(S = 5\%\) is the solubility of dust at surface ocean, \(r_{\text{Al}} = 8\%\) is Al dust fraction by weight, and \(F_{d0}\) is the flux of dust at surface which comes from the dust deposition field.

As dust particles sink they keep dissolving and cause another ~ 6% dissolution of Al throughout the ocean:

\[
\text{DISS} = \text{Al} \times [(F_{ds_{\text{in}}} - F_{ds_{\text{out}}}) + F_{dh_{\text{in}}} - F_{dh_{\text{out}}})]
\]

where \(F_{ds_{\text{in}}}\) and \(F_{dh_{\text{in}}}\) are soft (defined as easy to remineralization) or hard (defined as resistant to remineralization) dust flux coming into the layer, and \(F_{ds_{\text{out}}}\) and \(F_{dh_{\text{out}}}\) are soft or hard dust flux going out of the layer. They are derived by:

\[
F_{ds_{\text{out}}} = e^{-dz/L_{ds}} \times F_{ds_{\text{in}}}
\]

\[
F_{dh_{\text{out}}} = e^{-dz/L_{dh}} \times F_{dh_{\text{in}}}
\]

where \(dz\) is layer thickness, \(L_{ds} = 600\) m is the dissolution length scale for soft dust fractions, and \(L_{dh} = 120,000\) m is the dissolution length scale for hard dust fractions. In all
layers except the surface $F_{ds\_out}$ and $F_{ds\_out}$ from above equal $F_{ds\_in}$ and $F_{dh\_in}$ to the next layer. At the surface:

\begin{align}
F_{ds\_in} &= (1 - S) \times (1 - f_{hd}) \times F_{d0} \\
F_{dh\_in} &= (1 - S) \times f_{hd} \times F_{d0}
\end{align}

(6a) (6b)

where $f_{hd} = 97\%$ is the hard fraction of dust flux.

Remineralization of Al depends on POC remineralization:

$$
\text{REMIN} = \text{REMIN}_{OC} \times \frac{F_{Al\_in}}{(F_{POC\_in} + F_{POCh\_in})}
$$

(7)

where the notation and conventions for (6b) have been applied to soft and hard POC. $F_{Al\_in}$ is the particle Al flux coming into the layer. The flux $F_{Al\_in}$ are zero at the surface, while beneath the surface equals the outgoing flux $F_{Al\_out}$ from the above layer. The outgoing Al flux is defined as:

$$
F_{Al\_out} = F_{Al\_in} + \text{PROD} + 80\% \text{SCAV} - \text{REMIN}
$$

(8)

In the data Gehlen et al. [2002] reported, we found an approximate relation among bio-uptake Al, bio-uptake Si, dissolved Al and dissolved Si:

$$
\frac{\text{PROD}}{P_{Si}} = C_{1} \times \frac{[Al_{\text{diss}}]}{[Si_{\text{diss}}]}
$$

(9)

where $C_{1} = 0.08845$ is a constant. To avoid overflow, we set $P_{Si} \geq 0.1 \text{mmol m}^{-3}$.

Scavenging is the dominant process that removes dissolved Al. We model scavenging as proportional to the dissolved Al concentration

$$
\text{SCAV} = r_{scav} \times [Al_{\text{diss}}]
$$

(10)

where $r_{scav}$ is the scavenging rate and is determined by the surrounding particle concentration (including POC, CaCO$_3$, SiO$_2$ and dust)

$$
r_{scav} = r_{scav\_base} \times (F_{POC} \times C_{2} + F_{CaCO_3} \times C_{3} + F_{SiO_2} \times C_{4} + F_{d} \times C_{5})
$$

(11)

where $r_{scav\_base} = 0.077 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ is the base rate, we choose this rate to make the model results best fit the observations; $C_{2}, C_{3}, C_{4}, C_{5}$, are scaling factors, $F_{POC}$ is POC flux, $F_{CaCO_3}$ is CaCO$_3$ flux, $F_{SiO_2}$ is SiO$_2$ flux, and $F_{d}$ is dust flux.

Table 1: Sources of dissolved Al measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cruises or Locations</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cruises or Locations</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN107</td>
<td>Nov. 1983</td>
<td>Measures et al. [1984]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteor60</td>
<td>Mar.3 – Apr.19, 1982</td>
<td>Glimming [1985]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC90</td>
<td>Mar. 1990</td>
<td>Measures [1995]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC96</td>
<td>May 18 – Jun.20, 1996</td>
<td>Vink and Measures [2001]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC93</td>
<td>Aug. 1993</td>
<td>Hall and Measures [1998]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN120</td>
<td>Aug. – Sept., 1984</td>
<td>Measures et al. [1986]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMT-3</td>
<td>Sept.22 – Oct.25, 1996</td>
<td>Bowie et al. [2002]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT VIII</td>
<td>May 1 – May 29, 1990</td>
<td>Helmers and van der Loeff [1993]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT IX</td>
<td>OCT.19 – Nov.14, 1990</td>
<td>Helmers and van der Loeff [1993]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16NR</td>
<td>Jun.20 – Aug.8, 2003</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBEX</td>
<td>May, 1986</td>
<td>Hydes [1979]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K69/10</td>
<td>Oct. 1977</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATS</td>
<td>1983–1985</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>Apr. 1977</td>
<td>Stoffyn and Mackenzie [1982]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Jul. 1977</td>
<td>Stoffyn and Mackenzie [1982]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darwin cruise 50</td>
<td>Jul.11–20, 1990</td>
<td>Hydes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERTEX-4</td>
<td>Jul., 1983</td>
<td>Orians and Bruland [1985]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBARI SOLAS</td>
<td>Mar.–May,2001</td>
<td>Johnson et al. [2003]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC2002</td>
<td>May 1 – Jun.5, 2002</td>
<td>Measures et al. [2005]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOT</td>
<td>1994–1997</td>
<td>Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Ocean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stena Arctica</td>
<td>Jan., 1989</td>
<td>Moran et al. [1992]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India Ocean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORVSKC-34</td>
<td>Jul. – Aug., 1987</td>
<td>Narvekar and Singbal [1993]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cruises or Locations</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediterranean Sea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western &amp; Eastern Mediterranean</td>
<td>Apr. 1988</td>
<td>Brown et al. [1992]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The original data are not included in the published paper nor in our research.*
Table 2: Mean Al concentrations at surface (0–50 m) and sub-surface (150–500 m) ocean averaged by basin. Dust deposition flux comes from DEAD model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basin</th>
<th>Dust deposition flux (g m⁻² yr⁻¹)</th>
<th>Observed surface ocean (nM)</th>
<th>Modeled surface ocean (nM)</th>
<th>Observed sub-surface ocean (nM)</th>
<th>Modeled sub-surface ocean (nM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Atlantic</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>33.56</td>
<td>14.96</td>
<td>14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Atlantic</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>4.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Ocean</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediterranean Sea</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>65.15</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>97.45</td>
<td>102.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Sensitivity test. S: solubility; r: scavenging rate (yr$^{-1}$); rmsd: root mean square difference (after logarithm transformation). North Atlantic: the Atlantic at north of the equator; South Atlantic: the Atlantic at south of the equator; Equatorial Atlantic: 0–25°N, 0–40°W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model description</th>
<th>Surface Al concentration (nM), 0-50m</th>
<th>Residence time (yr), 0-50m</th>
<th>rmsd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Global North Atlantic South Atlantic Equatorial Atlantic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>23.55</td>
<td>15.76</td>
<td>29.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control run (S=5%,r=0.077)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>33.56</td>
<td>15.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low solubility (S=2.5%,r=0.077)</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High scavenge (S=5%,r=0.085)</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>32.56</td>
<td>14.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low scavenge (S=5%,r=0.069)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>35.83</td>
<td>16.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>