Increasing river alkalinity slows ocean acidification in the northern Gulf of Mexico

Fabian A Gomez¹, Rik Wanninkhof², Leticia Barbero³, and Sang-Ki Lee⁴

¹Mississippi State University ²OCD/AOML/NOAA ³National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) ⁴Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory (NOAA)

November 21, 2022

Abstract

Ocean acidification (OA) progression is affected by multiple factors, such as ocean warming, biological production, and runoff. Here we used an ocean-biogeochemical model to assess the impact of river runoff and climate variability on the spatiotemporal patterns of OA in the Gulf of Mexico (GoM) during 1981-2014. The model showed the expected pH and aragonite saturation state (Ω Ar) decline, due to the increase in anthropogenic carbon, with trends close to values reported for the Subtropical North Atlantic. However, significant departures from the basin-averaged pattern were obtained in part of the northern GoM shelf, where pH and Ω Ar increased. Model sensitivity analyses showed that OA progression was counteracted by enhanced alkalinity from the Mississippi-Atchafalaya River System. Our findings highlight that river alkalinity is a key driver of carbon system variability in river-dominated ocean margins and emphasize the need to quantify riverine chemistry to properly assess acidification in coastal waters.

1	Increasing river alkalinity slows ocean acidification in the northern Gulf of Mexico
2	Fabian A. Gomez ^{1,2} , Rik Wanninkhof ² , Leticia Barbero ^{3,2} , Sang-Ki Lee ²
3	¹ Northern Gulf Institute, Mississippi State University, Starkville, Mississippi, USA.
4	² NOAA Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory, Miami, Florida, USA.
5 6	³ Cooperative Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Studies, University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA.
7	
8	Corresponding author: Fabian A. Gomez (fabian.gomez@noaa.gov)
9	
10	Key Points:
11	• We simulated the spatiotemporal variability of ocean acidification progression over the
12	Gulf of Mexico during 1981-2014.
13	• Model results showed positive trends in the surface ocean alkalinity, salinity, and
14	temperature influencing acidification trends.
15	• Increasing Mississippi river alkalinity substantially lessened the ocean acidification
16	progression on the northern Gulf of Mexico shelf.

17 Abstract

Ocean acidification (OA) progression is affected by multiple factors, such as ocean warming, 18 19 biological production, and runoff. Here we used an ocean-biogeochemical model to assess the impact of river runoff and climate variability on the spatiotemporal patterns of OA in the Gulf of 20 21 Mexico (GoM) during 1981-2014. The model showed the expected pH and aragonite saturation state (Ω_{Ar}) decline, due to the increase in anthropogenic carbon, with trends close to values 22 reported for the Subtropical North Atlantic. However, significant departures from the basin-23 averaged pattern were obtained in part of the northern GoM shelf, where pH and Ω_{Ar} increased. 24 Model sensitivity analyses showed that OA progression was counteracted by enhanced alkalinity 25 from the Mississippi-Atchafalaya River System. Our findings highlight that river alkalinity is a 26 27 key driver of carbon system variability in river-dominated ocean margins and emphasize the need to quantify riverine chemistry to properly assess acidification in coastal waters. 28

29 Plain Language Summary

30 Although ocean acidification (OA) is mainly driven by the ocean uptake of anthropogenic carbon 31 dioxide from the atmosphere, multiple factors influence its temporal progression, including 32 changes in ocean temperature, biological processes, and river discharge. Here we used numerical model outputs to describe historical OA trends across the Gulf of Mexico (GoM) and identify the 33 main drivers of its spatial variability. We showed that changes in river runoff slowed OA over the 34 northern GoM coast. This was mainly due to an increasing Mississippi river alkalinity 35 concentration, a property related to the water capacity to neutralize acidification. Our results show 36 the importance of alkalinity changes to quantify OA progression in the GoM. 37

38 **1 Introduction**

Ocean acidification (OA), induced by the ocean uptake of atmospheric anthropogenic CO₂, 39 is affecting global ocean carbon chemistry, leading to a sustained decline in pH, along with an 40 increase in dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC), partial pressure of CO2 (pCO2), and calcium 41 carbonate solubility, the latter usually tracked as a decline in aragonite saturation state (Ω_{Ar}) 42 (Doney et al., 2009; Gruber et al., 2019). These changes in carbon chemistry are negatively 43 44 impacting marine species and ecosystems. The most obvious impacts are associated with decreased calcification rates in calcifying organisms, such as corals and shellfish, which results in reduced 45 individual growth and survival (e.g., Hoegh-Guldberg et al., 2007; Waldbusser et al., 2015). OA 46

47 is a major environmental stressor, which is expected to produce significant changes in marine
48 community structure and the availability of marine resources (Ekstrom et al., 2015; Cross et al.,
49 2019; Doney et al., 2020).

50 Datasets with records extending two or more decades have revealed long-term pCO₂ increases consistent with the increase in atmospheric CO₂, but variability is evident across regions 51 (Bates et al., 2014; Lauvset et al., 2015). Major departures from the anthropogenic CO₂-driven 52 changes can be expected in coastal regions, where variability in biological production, coastal 53 54 currents, temperature, and salinity are more likely to impact carbon chemistry trends (Cai et al., 55 2011; Turi et al., 2016; Laruelle et al., 2018; Salisbury & Jönsson, 2018). This is particularly true in river dominated ocean margins where the chemistry of river discharge directly influences the 56 ability of coastal waters to counteract acidification (Duarte et al., 2013,). Therefore, sustained 57 observational programs and modeling are required to identify OA progression and causes at 58 59 regional levels, so that ecosystem and socioeconomic vulnerabilities to OA can be assessed.

The Gulf of Mexico (GoM) hosts large spatiotemporal variability in its physical and 60 biogeochemical patterns and is significantly influenced by the Loop Current and the Mississippi-61 Atchafalaya River System (MARS). The Loop Current transports warm and oligotrophic waters 62 63 from the Caribbean Sea, and largely defines water properties in the open GoM (Muller-Karger et al., 2015; Damien et al., 2018). The MARS delivers large freshwater and nutrients fluxes to the 64 northern GoM shelf, strongly modulating regional salinity and biochemistry patterns (Dagg & 65 Breed, 2003; Rabalais et al., 2007). A series of observational studies have documented the 66 67 dominant spatial patterns and seasonal variability of pCO₂ and other carbon system variables in the GoM (e.g., Lohrenz et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2013; Wanninkhof et al., 2015; Hu et al., 2015, 68 2018). However, interannual to multi-decadal variability remains poorly examined due to the lack 69 of sufficiently long time-series capable of discriminating OA trends from natural variability. 70

High-resolution ocean-biogeochemical models can assist in filling observational gaps by describing and attributing ocean chemistry variability over time. Therefore, they are particularly valuable tools for assessing the historical progression of OA and other low-frequency processes that impact the carbon cycle. In a recent study, Gomez et al. (2020) configured and validated an ocean-biogeochemical model for the GoM, examining dominant seasonal patterns in pCO₂ and Ω_{Ar} . For the present study, we used the same model to investigate OA progression. We derived long-term trends for OA indicators during 1981-2014 and performed sensitivity analyses to
examine the influence of river runoff and climate variability on OA progression.

79 **2 Methods**

80 We used the ocean-biogeochemical model described and validated in Gomez et al. (2018, 2020), which contains 16 state variables, including two inorganic carbon system variables: total 81 alkalinity (TA) and DIC. The ocean-biogeochemical model was implemented in the Regional 82 Ocean Model System (ROMS, Shchepetkin et al., 2005), with a horizontal resolution of ~8 km 83 and 37 sigma-coordinate vertical levels. A third order upstream scheme and a fourth order Akima 84 85 scheme were used for horizontal and vertical momentum, respectively. A multidimensional positive definite advection transport algorithm (MPDATA) was used for tracer advection, while a 86 Mellor and Yamada 2.5-level closure scheme was used to resolve vertical turbulence. The initial 87 and open boundary conditions were derived from a 25 km horizontal resolution model for the 88 89 North Atlantic (Liu et al., 2015). Surface fluxes of momentum (6-hour resolution), heat (daily), and precipitation (monthly) were derived from the European Centre for Medium Range Weather 90 Forecasts reanalysis product ERA-Interim (Dee et al., 2011) using a bulk flux parameterization. 91 River discharge, nutrients, TA, and DIC data were obtained from the U.S. Geological Survey for 92 93 rivers in the U.S. and derived from scientific literature for Mexican rivers (He et al. 2011; Muñoz-Salinas & Castillo, 2015; Martínez-López & Zavala-Hidalgo, 2009). We prescribed a time-94 evolving monthly series of freshwater discharge for 28 river sources in the U.S., and a 95 climatological discharge for 10 rivers in the U.S. and 11 rivers in Mexico. Due to the lack of 96 continuous long-term records, the time evolving concentration of nutrients, TA, and DIC were 97 98 prescribed for only the Mississippi and Atchafalaya rivers, while long-term climatological values 99 were prescribed for the other river sources. The partial pressure of atmospheric CO_2 (p CO_{2air}) was prescribed as a continuous nonlinear function (using a third-degree polynomial expression plus 100 101 four harmonics) adjusted to the monthly pCO_{2air} series from the Mauna Loa Observatory.

In addition to the model hindcast, we also conduct two experiments to evaluate the OA progression sensitivity to river runoff changes: the climatological MARS chemistry experiment (CLM_MC) and the climatological rivers experiment (CLM_RIV). In CLM_MC, we used monthly climatological values for the MARS's chemistry (nutrients, DIC, and TA). In CLM_RIV,

we used climatological river discharge values for all rivers, as well as the climatological chemistry 106 for the MARS. The influence of MARS's time evolving chemistry on OA was obtained from the 107 difference between the CLM MC and hindcast trends, and the added impact of time evolving river 108 discharges and time-evolving MARS chemistry from the difference between the CLM RIV and 109 hindcast trends. Hence, the difference between the CLM MC and CLM RIV trends provided an 110 estimate of the discharge variability impacts on OA. Finally, to evaluate the influence of climate 111 variability on the OA patterns, we conducted the climatological forcing experiment 112 (CLM FORC), where we prescribed climatological patterns for rivers, surface fluxes and the open 113 boundary conditions at the southern and eastern edges of the model domain. The only exceptions 114 were pCO_{2air} and the open boundary conditions for DIC, which varied as in the model hindcast 115 (following Turi et al., 2016). The climate-variability impact was derived from the difference 116 117 between the CLM FORC and hindcast trends.

118 Monthly outputs of surface DIC (*s*DIC), surface TA (*s*TA), sea surface salinity (SSS), and 119 sea surface temperature (SST) were used to derive simulated in situ patterns of three OA indicators: 120 pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} . To this effect, we used the CO2SYS program for CO₂ System Calculations 121 (van Heuven et al., 2011). A simple linear regression was used to calculate the trends from the 122 model's monthly anomalies for each variable of interest. Monthly outputs with the monthly 123 climatological mean of 1981-2014 removed (deseasonalized) were referred to as anomalies.

124 We used a first order Taylor series to decompose the surface pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} variability 125 into their four driver's components:

126
$$\Delta \varphi \approx \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial SDIC} \cdot \Delta SDIC + \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial STA} \cdot \Delta STA + \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial SSS} \cdot \Delta SSS + \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial SST} \cdot \Delta SST \quad (1)$$

where $\Delta \varphi$ represents the time change for the parameter of interest (either pCO₂, pH, or Ω_{Ar}), and the four right side terms represent the *s*DIC, *s*TA, SSS, and SST contribution to the φ change, respectively. The partial derivatives of the contribution terms were estimated by adding a small perturbation to each driver while keeping the other three terms as constant, using the CO2SYS program for the carbon system calculations.

132 **3 Results**

The simulated patterns of surface pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} anomalies produced basin-averaged 133 trends of 1.57 ± 0.03 µatm yr⁻¹, -0.0015 ± 0.0000 yr⁻¹, and -0.0087 ± 0.0002 yr⁻¹ during 1981-134 2014, respectively. The mean surface pCO_2 trend was somewhat smaller than the growth of 135 atmospheric CO₂, which was at a mean rate of 1.68 µatm yr⁻¹ over the same period. Large spatial 136 variability was evident in the modeled trends (Figures 1a-1c; Table S1), suggesting that local 137 processes were influencing the long-term changes. The largest departures from the basin-averaged 138 values were located near the MARS delta, in the central part of the northern GoM shelf, where 139 140 negative pCO₂ trends and positive Ω_{Ar} and pH trends were obtained nearshore. As a result, the average trend on the northern GoM inner shelf (bottom depth < 25 m; Figure 1f) was 0.93 ± 0.10 141 μ atm yr⁻¹, -0.0009 ± 0.0001 yr⁻¹ and -0.0003 ± 0.0009 yr⁻¹ for pCO₂, pH and Ω_{Ar} , respectively, 142 the slowest rates compared to those in other shelves and the open GoM. The modeled long-term 143 changes in surface pCO₂ impacted the air-sea CO₂ flux (Figure 1d, Table S1). The most prominent 144 feature was on the northern GoM inner shelf, where the CO₂ flux trend was strongly negative 145 (increase in carbon uptake), averaging -0.018 ± 0.003 mol m⁻² yr⁻² for a mean flux of -0.844 mol 146 m^{-2} yr⁻¹, but reaching maximum trend magnitude rates greater than $-0.050 \text{ mol } m^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-2}$ near the 147 MARS delta. The basin-averaged flux trend was -0.004 ± 0.001 mol m⁻² yr⁻² for a model mean 148 flux of -0.382 mol m² yr⁻¹. 149

150 Changes in surface pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} are connected to changes in DIC, TA, salinity, and temperature. Both pH and Ω_{Ar} increase with TA and decrease with DIC and salinity. However, 151 their response to temperature differs, as warming decreases calcium carbonate solubility 152 153 (increasing Ω_{Ar}) but promotes hydrogen ion formation (decreasing pH). pCO₂ displays the opposite pattern to that of pH, increasing with DIC, salinity, and temperature, and decreasing with TA. A 154 potential reason for the small pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} trends on the northern GoM shelf could be an 155 increased biological uptake of DIC that counteracts the DIC increase due to anthropogenic CO₂. 156 However, the simulated surface net community production -the difference between phytoplankton 157 production and community respiration- displayed a weak negative trend near the MARS delta, 158 linked to decreased river discharge and nutrient runoff (Figure 1e). Consequently, a biologically 159 driven offset of the modeled OA trends was discarded. 160

161 To identify processes responsible for the simulated OA pattern, we examined the Taylor 162 decomposition of the pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} trends. The patterns showed that sDIC, which had a basin-

averaged growth of $1.16 \pm 0.02 \,\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1} \,\text{yr}^{-1}$, dominated the total trend variability (Figures 2a– 163 2c; Figure 3a; Table S1). The greatest sDIC impact was on the northern GoM inner shelf, where 164 the sDIC trend was 1.7 times the basin value. This implied that the slow OA progression in the 165 region was not driven by sDIC. Instead, the main process responsible for the slow acidification 166 was a significant sTA growth of $1.90 \pm 0.22 \,\mu$ mol kg⁻¹ yr⁻¹, which largely counteracted the sDIC-167 induced changes (Figures 2d-2f; Figure 3b; Table S1). The contributions of SSS and SST to the 168 pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} trends were relatively minor (Figures 2g–2l). The salinity increase, which 169 averaged 0.007 yr⁻¹ over the GoM basin and reached values greater than 0.020 yr⁻¹ over the 170 northern GoM shelf and the southern part of the West Florida shelf (Figure 3c; Table S1), 171 strengthened the OA pattern. Surface warming, which was 0.008 ± 0.002 °C yr⁻¹ on average across 172 the GoM basin (Figure 3d; Table S1), contributed to increase the magnitude of the pH and pCO₂ 173 trends, and had a weak positive impact on Ω_{Ar} . Although small in magnitude, the SSS and SST-174 induced changes influenced the spatial OA pattern. If we removed the SSS and SST contribution 175 176 from the total trends, a smoother trend pattern was obtained (Figure S1).

The trend decomposition revealed that sTA played a key role as driver of the simulated OA 177 trends around the MARS delta. Strong sTA growth on the northern GoM shelf, as well as the 178 179 enhanced sDIC trend, could be linked to changes in MARS chemistry. This was evident when we compared the low-frequency TA and DIC changes for the MARS and the surface northern GoM 180 shelf waters (Figure S2). The TA and DIC from the MARS increased about 5 and 3 µmol kg⁻¹ yr⁻ 181 ¹ during 1981-2014, respectively (Table S2). Declining trends in river discharge ($-67 \pm 54 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ 182 yr⁻¹ for the MARS; -53 ± 19 m³ s⁻¹ yr⁻¹ for rivers other than MARS) could also contribute to the 183 nearshore sTA and sDIC increase. This is because most rivers along the northern GoM coast, 184 excluding those in the southern and central Texas coast, have relatively low TA and DIC 185 concentration compared to the ocean values; thus, a decreasing discharge implies a reduced 186 influence of the river's dilution effect on these two variables. To quantify the influence of rivers 187 on the ocean carbonate system, we examined the patterns derived from the CLM RIV and 188 CLM MC experiments and compared them with the model hindcast. Over the northern GoM shelf, 189 CLM RIV showed that changes in river discharge and MARS chemistry accounted for 84% of the 190 hindcast sTA trend and 40% of the hindcast sDIC trend (Figures 3e and 3f; Table S3). Over the 191 same region, CLM MC showed that the MARS chemistry changes (excluding river flow changes) 192 193 accounted for 61% of the hindcast sTA trend and 32% of the hindcast sDIC trend (Figures S3a and S3b; Table S3). Consequently, changes in river discharge (CLM_MC minus CLM_RIV) accounted for 23% and 8% of the hindcast's TA and DIC trends, respectively (Figures S3e and S3f). Although the sTA trend substantially decreased in the CLM_RIV experiment, a residual TA trend remained across the basin, consistent with a positive trend in SSS (Figure 3g). This sTA and SSS variation, connected to variability in the boundary conditions and a negative trend in precipitation minus evaporation (Figure S4), largely vanished in the CLM_FORC experiment (Figures 3j and 3k).

201 On the northern GoM shelf, the average OA indicators trends in the climatological experiments displayed the same sign than in the hindcast run but with a greater magnitude (Figure 202 203 4; Table S3). River runoff had a much stronger impact on Ω_{Ar} than on pCO₂ or pH. This was mostly related to the variable's sensitivity to changes in TA and DIC. Ω_{Ar} is slightly more responsive to 204 changes in TA than DIC, whereas pCO₂ and pH are more responsive to changes in DIC than TA 205 (Table S4). Consequently, the DIC-driven changes counteracted to a greater degree the TA-driven 206 changes in the cases of pCO₂ and pH. For other coastal regions and the open GoM, the 207 climatological experiments produced relatively weak trend changes in the OA indicators. At the 208 209 basin level, the effect of river runoff contributed to reduce the pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} trends by 5%, 6%, and 10%, respectively, while the effect of climate variability contributed to reduce the same 210 trends by 2%, 3%, and 19%, respectively (Figure S5; Table S3). Note that the removal of the 211 surface warming trend in the CLM FORC experiment (Figure 31) lessened the growth of pCO₂ 212 and the decline of pH, which explained why the strongest pCO₂ and pH trends were obtained by 213 214 CLM RIV rather than CLM FORC.

215 4 Discussion

High-resolution ocean models are valuable tools to describe OA trends, particularly in the 216 absence of long-term carbon chemistry time-series. In open GoM waters, our model outputs 217 showed surface trends of $1.59 \pm 0.02 \ \mu atm \ yr^{-1}$, $-0.0016 \pm 0.0000 \ yr^{-1}$, and $-0.0093 \pm 0.0001 \ yr^{-1}$ 218 219 ¹ for the mean pCO₂, pH, and Ω_{Ar} anomalies from 1981-2014, respectively. These values are close to previous estimations for subtropical waters in the North Atlantic (Table S5). Along the coastal 220 margins of the GoM, our model revealed significant variations in the OA trend. Estimated shelf 221 averages for the four shelves (Figure 1f) ranged from 1.31 to 1.70 µatm yr⁻¹ for pCO₂, from – 222 0.0013 to -0.0017 yr⁻¹ for pH, and from -0.0042 to -0.0094 yr⁻¹ for Ω_{Ar} . For 1996-2018, Kealoha 223

et al. (2020) reported mean pCO₂ trends of 3.20 ± 1.47 µatm yr⁻¹ and 0.08 ± 1.66 on the western 224 and central parts of the northern GoM shelf, and 2.35 ± 0.82 µatm yr⁻¹ on the West Florida shelf. 225 The large trend discrepancies between their estimates and ours are most likely due to the limited 226 spatiotemporal coverage of the pCO₂ datasets used by Kealoha et al. (2020), mostly based on 227 underway ship measurements. This limited coverage, added to the large interannual carbon 228 chemistry variability driven by the MARS runoff, determined a large uncertainty to their long-229 term trend calculations. This also applies to the very strong pCO₂ trend reported in Robbins et al. 230 (2018) for the West Florida shelf (4.37 μ atm yr⁻¹). 231

232 Although it is expected that CO₂ in the ocean follows the atmospheric CO₂ growth, multiple studies have shown differences between the ocean and atmospheric CO2 trends, as interannual and 233 interdecadal variability can exert a significant impact on the ocean sink and pCO₂ trend trajectories 234 (McKinley et al., 2020; Bates & Johnson, 2020). Our model results showed that the basin-averaged 235 236 pCO₂ trend for 1981-2014 was 7% smaller than the historic atmospheric CO₂ trend. Once we removed the effect associated with river runoff in the CLM RIV experiment, the difference was 237 238 insignificant (1%). The positive sTA trend had a significant impact on the three OA indicators examined, contributing to lessen OA progression. The largest sTA increase was on the northern 239 GoM shelf associated with MARS chemistry changes, but the model also exhibited positive sTA 240 trends over the open GoM that were not connected to the coastal sTA signature. This result was 241 242 consistent with observational studies documenting significant alkalinity growth in the subtropical north Atlantic during the last decades (Bates et al., 2014; Bates & Johnson, 2020; Fine et al., 2017). 243 Besides the sTA growth, the model simulated positive trends for SSS and SST. Surface pCO₂ and 244 pH were especially sensitive to SST changes, with surface warming contributing to accentuate the 245 pCO₂ and pH magnitude in trends. 246

The MARS is a key driver of hydrographic and biogeochemical patterns on the northern 247 GoM shelf. Multiple studies have reported its influence on salinity, coastal circulation, plankton 248 production, nutrients, dissolved oxygen, and carbon chemistry (e.g., Dagg & Breed, 2003; Rabalais 249 et al., 2007; Lohrenz et al., 2012; Huang et al., 2015). Our study adds another aspect to the impact 250 of the MARS runoff, showing that increasing trends in the river alkalinity had a strong buffering 251 effect nearshore. A sensitivity analysis using climatological forced experiments indicated that 252 253 changes in MARS chemistry accounted for a 42% reduction in the mean surface Ω_{Ar} trend 254 magnitude over the northern GoM shelf. Changes in river discharge further reduced this Ω_{Ar} trend

magnitude by 8%. Although the potential for watershed export changes to counteract OA patterns 255 has been long recognized (Provoost et al., 2010; Duarte et al., 2013; Montagna et al., 2018), 256 previous OA studies on the northern GoM shelf have mainly focused on the link between coastal 257 eutrophication and subsurface acidification (e.g., Cai et al., 2011), disregarding the effect of 258 riverine alkalinity changes. Quantifying river runoff impacts on OA trends is difficult due to the 259 lack of observations to describe historical river chemistry changes. We could only prescribe time-260 evolving TA, DIC, and nutrients concentration for the MARS, which accounts for 80% of the total 261 river discharge in the northern GoM, and climatological TA, DIC, and nutrients for other rivers. 262 Thus, the potential impacts linked to secular chemistry changes in small rivers have not been 263 accurately represented. Although acidification has been suggested for Texas rivers (Hu et al., 264 2015) several studies have shown that the dominant pattern for the U.S. rivers is alkalinization, 265 linked to agriculture practices such as changes in water fluxes and liming (e.g., Raymond et al., 266 2008; Kaushal et al., 2013; Stets et al., 2014). Therefore, we could expect that carbon-chemistry 267 trends in small rivers would mostly contribute to strengthening, at a local scale, the simulated sTA 268 trend driven by MARS runoff. 269

270 **5** Conclusions

Our model results showed significant long-term changes in carbon system patterns across 271 the GoM mainly driven by an increase in atmospheric CO₂. The simulated basin-average patterns 272 in the open GoM were consistent with observational studies of OA in subtropical North Atlantic 273 waters. However, a slow OA progression was found on the northern GoM shelf, associated with a 274 significant increase in sTA. The large sTA trend over the northern GoM shelf was mainly due to 275 a positive trend in MARS alkalinity, and secondarily due to the declining discharge trends of low 276 alkalinity rivers. Our study shows the interplay of multiple processes influencing carbon system 277 278 variability.

279 Acknowledgments

This article was supported by the NOAA's Ocean Acidification Program and NOAA's Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory. The research was conducted under NOAA's awards to the Cooperative Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Studies (NA15OAR4320064), and the Northern Gulf Institute (361461-191001-021000). We thank Jay Harris for his kind assistance with the model experiments, and Emily Osbourne and Gail Derr for their carefulmanuscript review.

286 Data Availability Statement

- 287 The model outputs used in this study are provided as supplementary information for peer review
- purposes. Model outputs will be made available in a NOAA repository. The USGS datasets, the
- 289 ERA-interim reanalysis product, and the atmospheric CO₂ time-series at Mauna Loa Observatory
- 290 were obtained at <u>https://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis/inventory/</u>,
- 291 <u>https://apps.ecmwf.int/datasets/data/interim-full-daily/levtype=sfc/;</u> and
- 292 <u>https://gml.noaa.gov/webdata/ccgg/trends/co2/co2_mm_mlo.txt</u>, respectively.

293 **References**

- Bates, N. R., Astor, Y. M., Church, M. J., Currie, K., Dore, J. E., González-Dávila, M., et al.
 (2014). A time-series view of changing ocean chemistry due to ocean uptake of anthropogenic
 CO₂ and ocean acidification. *Oceanography*, 27(1): 126–141.
- Bates, N. R., & Johnson, R. J. (2020). Acceleration of ocean warming, salinification,
 deoxygenation and acidification in the surface subtropical North Atlantic
 Ocean. *Communications Earth & Environment*, *l*(1), 1–12.
- 300 Busch, D. S., Bennett-Mintz, J. M., Armstrong, C. T., Jewett, E. B., Gledhill, D. K., & Ombres, E.
- H. (2018). NOAA Ocean Acidification Program: Taking Stock and Looking Forward, A
 summary of the 2017 Principal Investigators' Meeting. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, *NOAA Technical Memorandum OAR-OAP-1*, 50 p.
- Cai, W. J., Hu, X., Huang, W. J., Murrell, M. C., Lehrter, J. C., Lohrenz, S. E., et al. (2011).
 Acidification of subsurface coastal waters enhanced by eutrophication. *Nature geoscience*,
 4(11), 766–770.
- Cross, J. N., Turner, J. A., Cooley, S. R., Newton, J. A., Azetsu-Scott, K., Chambers, R. C., et al.
 (2019). The Knowledge-to-Action Pipeline: Connecting Ocean Acidification Research and
 Actionable Decision Support. *Frontiers in Marine Science*, *6*, p.356.
- 310 Dagg, M. J. & Breed, G. A. (2003). Biological effects of Mississippi River nitrogen on the northern
- 311 Gulf of Mexico–a review and synthesis. J. Mar. Syst., 43(3-4), 133–152.
- 312 Damien, P., Pasqueron de Fommervault, O., Sheinbaum, J., Jouanno, J., Camacho-Ibar, V. F., &

- 313 Duteil, O. (2018). Partitioning of the open waters of the Gulf of Mexico based on the seasonal
- and interannual variability of chlorophyll concentration. J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 123(4),
 2592–2614.
- Dee, D. P., Uppala, S. M., Simmons, A. J., Berrisford, P., Poli, P., Kobayashi, S., et al. (2011).
- 317 The ERA-Interim reanalysis: configuration and performance of the data assimilation system.
- 318 *Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 137, 553–597.
- Doney, S. C., Busch, D. S., Cooley, S. R., & Kroeker, K. J. (2020). The Impacts of Ocean
 Acidification on Marine Ecosystems and Reliant Human Communities. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 45:83–112.
- Doney, S. C., Fabry, V. J., Feely, R. A., & Kleypas, J. A. (2009). Ocean acidification: the other
 CO2 problem. *Annu. Rev. Mar. Sci.*, 1, 169–92.
- Duarte, C. M., Hendriks, I. E., Moore, T. S., Olsen, Y. S., Steckbauer, A., Ramajo, L., et al. (2013).
- Is ocean acidification an open-ocean syndrome? Understanding anthropogenic impacts on seawater pH. *Estuaries and Coasts*, *36*(2), 221-236.
- Ekstrom, J. A., Suatoni, L., Cooley, S. R., Pendleton, L. H., Waldbusser, G. G., Cinner, J. E., et
 al. (2015). Vulnerability and adaptation of US shellfisheries to ocean acidification. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(3), 207–214.
- Fine, R. A., Willey, D. A., & Millero, F. J. (2017). Global variability and changes in ocean total
 alkalinity from Aquarius satellite data. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44(1), 261–267.
- Gledhill, D. K., Wanninkhof, R., Millero, F. J., & Eakin, M. (2008). Ocean acidification of the
 greater Caribbean region 1996–2006. *J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans*, *113*(C10).
- 334 Gomez, F. A., Lee, S. K., Liu, Y., Hernandez Jr, F. J., Muller-Karger, F. E., & Lamkin, J.
- T. (2018). Seasonal patterns in phytoplankton biomass across the northern and deep Gulf of
 Mexico: a numerical model study, *Biogeosciences*, 15, 3561–3576.
- 337 Gomez, F. A., Wanninkhof, R., Barbero, L., Lee, S. K., & Hernandez, F. J. (2020). Seasonal
- patterns of surface inorganic carbon system variables in the Gulf of Mexico inferred from a
 regional high-resolution ocean biogeochemical model, *Biogeosciences*, 17, 1685–1700.
- Gruber, N., Clement, D., Carter, B. R., Feely, R. A., Van Heuven, S., Hoppema, M., et al. (2019).
- 341 The oceanic sink for anthropogenic CO_2 from 1994 to 2007. *Science*, *363*(6432), 1193-1199.
- He, B., Kanae, S., Oki, T., Hirabayashi, Y., Yamashiki, Y., & Takara, K. (2011). Assessment of
- 343 global nitrogen pollution in rivers using an integrated biogeochemical modeling framework.

- 344 *Water Res.*, 45, 2573–2586.
- Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Mumby, P. J., Hooten, A. J., Steneck, R. S., Greenfield, P., Gomez, E., et al.
 (2007). Coral reefs under rapid climate change and ocean acidification. *Science*, *318*(5857),
 1737–1742.
- Hu, X., Nuttall, M. F., Wang, H., Yao, H., Staryk, C. J., McCutcheon, M. R., et al. (2018). Seasonal
- variability of carbonate chemistry and decadal changes in waters of a marine sanctuary in the
 Gulf of Mexico. *Marine Chemistry*, 205, 16–28.
- Hu, X., Pollack, J. B., McCutcheon, M. R., Montagna, P. A., & Ouyang, Z. (2015). Long-term
 alkalinity decrease and acidification of estuaries in northwestern Gulf of Mexico. *Environmental science & technology*, 49(6), 3401–3409.
- Huang, W. J., Cai, W. J., Wang, Y., Lohrenz, S. E., & Murrell, M. C. (2015). The carbon dioxide
 system on the Mississippi River-dominated continental shelf in the northern Gulf of Mexico:
- 1. Distribution and air-sea CO2 flux. J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 120(3), 1429–1445.
- Kaushal, S. S., Likens, G. E., Utz, R. M., Pace, M. L., Grese, M., & Yepsen, M. (2013). Increased
 river alkalinization in the Eastern US. *Environmental science & technology*, 47(18), 10302–
 10311.
- Kealoha, A. K., Shamberger, K. E., DiMarco, S. F., Thyng, K. M., Hetland, R. D., Manzello, D.
 P., et al. (2020). Surface Water CO₂ variability in the Gulf of Mexico (1996–2017). *Scientific reports*, 10(1), 1–13.
- Laruelle, G. G., Cai, W. J., Hu, X., Gruber, N., Mackenzie, F. T., & Regnier, P. (2018). Continental
 shelves as a variable but increasing global sink for atmospheric carbon dioxide. *Nature communications*, 9. 454.
- Lauvset, S. K., Gruber, N., Landschützer, P., Olsen, A., & Tjiputra, J. F. Trends and drivers in
 global surface ocean pH over the past 3 decades. *Biogeosciences*, *12*(5), 1285–1298 (2015).
- Liu, Y., Lee, S. K., Enfield, D. B., Muhling, B. A., Lamkin, J. T., Muller-Karger, F. E., & Roffer,
- M. A. (2015). Potential impact of climate change on the Intra-Americas Sea: Part-1, A dynamic downscaling of the CMIP5 model projections. *J. Mar. Syst.*, 148, 56–69.
- Lohrenz, S. E., Cai, W. J., Chakraborty, S., Huang, W. J., Guo, X., He, R., et al. (2018). Satellite
 estimation of coastal pCO2 and air–sea flux of carbon dioxide in the northern Gulf of Mexico,
 Remote Sens. Environ., 207, 71–83.
- Lohrenz, S. E., Cai, W. J., Chen, F., Chen, X., & Tuel, M. (2010). Seasonal variability in air-sea

- fluxes of CO₂ in a river influenced coastal margin. J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 115, C10034.
- Martínez-López, B., & Zavala-Hidalgo, J. (2009). Seasonal and interannual variability of crossshelf transports of chlorophyll in the Gulf of Mexico. *J. Mar. Syst.*, 77, 1–20.
- McKinley, G. A., Fay, A. R., Eddebbar, Y. A., Gloege, L., & Lovenduski, N. S. (2020). External
 forcing explains recent decadal variability of the ocean carbon sink. *AGU Advances*, 1,
 e2019AV000149.
- Montagna, P. A., Hu, X., Palmer, T. A., & Wetz, M. (2018). Effect of hydrological variability on
 the biogeochemistry of estuaries across a regional climatic gradient. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, *63*(6),
 2465–2478.
- Muller-Karger, F. E., Smith, J. P., Werner, S., Chen, R., Roffer, M., Liu, Y., et al. (2015). Natural
 variability of surface oceanographic conditions in the offshore Gulf of Mexico. *Progress in Oceanography*, 134, 54–76.
- Muñoz-Salinas, E. & Castillo, M. (2015). Streamflow and sediment load assessment from 1950 to
 2006 in the Usumacinta and Grijalva Rivers (Southern Mexico) and the influence of ENSO.
- 389 *Catena*, 127, 270–278.
- Provoost, P., Van Heuven, S., Soetaert, K., Laane, R. W. P. M., & Middelburg, J. J. (2010).
 Seasonal and long-term changes in pH in the Dutch coastal zone, *Biogeosciences*, 7(11), 3869–
 3878.
- 393 Rabalais, N. N., Turner, R. E., Gupta, B. S., Boesch, D. F., Chapman, P., & Murrell, M. C. (2007).
- Hypoxia in the northern Gulf of Mexico: Does the science support the plan to reduce, mitigate,
 and control hypoxia?. *Estuaries and Coasts*, 30(5), 753–772.
- Raymond, P. A., Oh, N. H., Turner, R. E., & Broussard, W. (2008). Anthropogenically enhanced
 fluxes of water and carbon from the Mississippi River. *Nature*, *451*(7177), 449–452.

398 Robbins, L. L., Daly, K. L., Barbero, L., Wanninkhof, R., He, R., Zong, H., et al. (2018). Spatial

- and temporal variability of pCO₂, carbon fluxes and saturation state on the West Florida Shelf. *J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans*, 123.
- Salisbury, J. E., & Jönsson, B. F. (2018). Rapid warming and salinity changes in the Gulf of Maine
 alter surface ocean carbonate parameters and hide ocean acidification. *Biogeochemistry*, *141*(3), 401–418.
- 404 Shchepetkin, A. F., & McWilliams, J. C. (2005). The regional oceanic modeling system (ROMS):
- 405 a split-explicit, free-surface, topography-following-coordinate oceanic model. Ocean Model.,

- 406 9, 347–404.
- Stets, E. G., Kelly, V. J., & Crawford, C. G. (2014). Long-term trends in alkalinity in large rivers
 of the conterminous US in relation to acidification, agriculture, and hydrologic modification. *Sci. Total Environ.*, 488, 280–289.
- 410 Turi, G., Lachkar, Z., Gruber, N., & Münnich, M. (2016). Climatic modulation of recent trends in
- ocean acidification in the California Current System, *Environmental Research Letters*, 11(1),
 p.014007.
- van Heuven, S. M. A. C., Pierrot, D., Rae, J. W. B., Lewis E., & Wallace D. W. R. (2011).
 MATLAB program developed for CO2 system calculations. ORNL/CDIAC-105b. Carbon
- 415 Dioxide Information Analysis Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, US Department of
- 416 Energy, Oak Ridge, Tennessee, 530.
- 417 Waldbusser, G. G., Hales, B., Langdon, C. J., Haley, B. A., Schrader, P., Brunner, E. L., et al.
- (2015). Saturation-state sensitivity of marine bivalve larvae to ocean acidification. *Nature Climate Change*, 5(3), 273–280.
- Wang, Z. A., Wanninkhof, R., Cai, W. J., Byrne, R. H., Hu, X., Peng, T. H., & Huang, W. J.
 (2013). The marine inorganic carbon system along the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic coasts of
 the United States: Insights from a transregional coastal carbon study. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 58,
 325–342.
- Wanninkhof, R., Barbero, L., Byrne, R., Cai, W. J., Huang, W. J., Zhang, J. Z., et al. (2015). Ocean
 acidification along the Gulf Coast and East Coast of the USA. *Continental Shelf Research*, 98,
 54–71.
- 427 Wanninkhof, R., Trinanes, J., Park, G.-H., Gledhill, D., & Olsen, A. (2019). Large decadal changes
- in air-sea CO₂ fluxes in the Caribbean Sea. Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans, 124,
 6960–6982, https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015366
- 430 Xu, Y. Y., Cai, W. J., Wanninkhof, R., Salisbury, J., Reimer, J., & Chen, B. (2020). Long-term
- 431 changes of carbonate chemistry variables along the north American East Coast. J. Geophys.
- 432 *Res.-Oceans: Oceans, 125*(7), 2019JC015982.



Figure 1. Surface trends of (a) partial pressure of CO_2 , (b) pH, c) aragonite saturation state, (d) air-sea CO_2 flux, and (e) net community production derived from the model hindcast. (f) Areas used to derive subregional trend patterns: (1) northern GoM shelf; (2) West Florida shelf; (3) Yucatan shelf; (4) western GoM shelf; and (5) open GoM. Red and green dots in (f) depict the Mississippi and Atchafalaya mouths, respectively. Negative CO_2 flux trend implies increasing carbon uptake. Black contours depict the 25 and 200 m isobaths. The 25 m isobath defines the limit between the inner and outer shelf.



Figure 2. Taylor series decomposition of the surface partial pressure of CO_2 (µatm yr⁻¹; upper panels), surface pH (yr⁻¹; middle panels), and surface aragonite saturation state (yr⁻¹; bottom panels) trends derived from the model hindcast. Patterns terms represent the contribution of (**a**–**c**) surface dissolved inorganic carbon (sDIC); (**d**–**f**) surface total alkalinity (sTA); (**g**–**i**) sea surface salinity (SSS); and (**j**–**l**) sea surface temperature (SST). Black contours depict the 25 and 200 m isobaths.



Hindcast experiment

Figure 3. Trends of surface dissolved inorganic carbon (sDIC), surface total alkalinity (sTA), sea
surface salinity (SSS), and sea surface temperature (SST) as derived from the (a–d) hindcast, (e–
h) climatological rivers (CLM_RIV), and (i–l) climatological forcing (CLM_FORC) experiments.
Trends for sDIC and sTA are in µmol kg⁻¹ yr⁻¹, for SSS in yr⁻¹, and for SST in °C yr⁻¹. Black
contours depict the 25 and 200 m isobaths.



459

Figure 4. Trend decomposition of ocean acidification indicators over the northern GoM shelf derived from the hindcast, CLM_MC, CLM_RIV, and CLM_FORC experiments: (**a**) partial pressure of CO₂ (pCO₂), (**b**) pH, and (**c**) aragonite saturation state (Ω_{Ar}). Red, blue, green, and yellow bars represent the contribution of surface dissolved inorganic carbon (sDIC), surface total alkalinity (sTA), sea surface salinity (SSS), and sea surface temperature (SST) to the total trend (in black), respectively.

@AGUPUBLICATIONS

Geophysical Research Letters

Supporting Information for

Increasing river alkalinity slows ocean acidification in the northern Gulf of Mexico

Fabian A. Gomez^{1,2}, Rik Wanninkhof², Leticia Barbero^{3,2}, Sang-Ki Lee²

¹ Northern Gulf Institute, Mississippi State University, Starkville, Mississippi, USA
 ² NOAA Atlantic Oceanographic and Meteorological Laboratory, Miami, Florida, USA
 ³ Cooperative Institute for Marine and Atmospheric Studies, University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA

Contents of this file

Figures S1 to S5 Tables S1 to S5

Additional Supporting Information

Datasets S1 to S29

Introduction

The following figures and tables provide complementary information to the main manuscript.



Figure S1. Trend patterns for (a) partial pressure of CO₂ (pCO₂), (b) pH, and (c) aragonite saturation state (Ω_{Ar}) after removing the salinity and temperature effect. Black contours depict the 25 and 200 m isobaths.



Figure S2. Mississippi river and northern GoM shelf patterns in carbonate chemistry. Low frequency patterns for (a) alkalinity and (b) dissolved inorganic carbon in the Mississippi river and the surface layer of the northern GoM shelf.

CLM_MC experiment



Figure S3. (a–d) Trend patterns for surface dissolved inorganic carbon (sDIC), surface total alkalinity (sTA), sea surface salinity (SSS), and sea surface temperature (SST) derived from climatological MARS chemistry experiment (CLM_MC); (e–h) Differences between trend patterns from CLM_MC and climatological river experiment (CLM_RIV). Trends for sDIC and sTA are in µmol kg⁻¹ yr⁻¹, for SSS in yr⁻¹, and for SST in °C yr⁻¹. Black contours depict the 25 and 200 m isobaths.



Figure S4. Average time series of precipitation minus evaporation anomaly across the Gulf of Mexico. Red line depicts the linear regression for 1981–2014. Long-term trend is indicated in blue.



Figure S5. Sensitivity analysis for the simulated ocean acidification indicator's trends: (a) partial pressure of CO₂ trend (μ atm yr⁻¹), (b) pH trend (yr⁻¹), and (c) aragonite saturation state trend (yr⁻¹) derived from the model hindcast, climatological MARS chemistry experiment (CLM_MC), climatological rivers experiment (CLM_RIV), and climatological forcing experiment (CLM_FORC). Black contours depict the 25 and 200 m isobaths.

	SST trend	SSS trend	sTA trend	sDIC trend	pCO ₂ trend	pH trend	Ω_{Ar} trend	CO ₂ flux trend
	[10 ⁻³ °C yr ⁻¹]	[10 ⁻³ yr ⁻¹]	[µmol kg ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹]	[µmol kg ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹]	[µatm yr ⁻¹]	[10 ⁻³ yr ⁻¹]	[10 ⁻³ yr ⁻¹]	$[mmol m^{-2} yr^{-2}]$
GoM basin	7.93	6.63	0.31	1.16	1.57	-1.53	-8.66	-3.68
	(2.02)	(0.90)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.15)	(0.95)
1. Northern	13.98	22.09	1.26	1.67	1.31	-1.34	-4.18	-9.18
GoM shelf	(3.42)	(4.66)	(0.14)	(0.11)	(0.07)	(0.08)	(0.57)	(2.74)
Inner shelf	13.92	27.32	1.90	1.97	0.93	-0.94	-0.26*	-17.61
miler sheri	(4.16)	(6.60)	(0.22)	(0.17)	(0.10)	(0.11)	(0.85)	(2.79)
Outer shelf	14.02	18.05	0.76	1.45	1.61	-1.64	-7.18	-2.69*
Outer sheri	(2.99)	(3.63)	(0.08)	(0.07)	(0.06)	(0.07)	(0.43)	(1.80)
2. West Florida	10.69	10.55	0.32	1.12	1.64	-1.59	-8.21	2.38*
shelf	(3.73)	(1.91)	(0.03)	(0.02)	(0.05)	(0.05)	(0.29)	(1.51)
Inner shelf north	8.93	21.57	0.43	1.03	1.55	-1.48	-6.57	1.78*
27°N	(5.02)	(3.74)	(0.06)	(0.04)	(0.08)	(0.08)	(0.40)	(1.92)
Inner shelf south	17.59	13.30	0.32	1.15	1.87	-1.78	-8.62	4.86
27°N	(4.56)	(2.09)	(0.09)	(0.03)	(0.07)	(0.07)	(0.46)	(1.48)
0.4 1.10	9.32	5.75	0.31	1.14	1.61	-1.58	-8.69	1.88*
Outer shell	(3.22)	(1.67)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.25)	(1.50)
2 Vucator shalf	5.32	2.28	0.17	1.09	1.59	-1.51	-9.37	-3.53
5. I ucatali shell	(2.19)	(0.57)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.16)	(0.91)
Inn on shalf	6.22	3.26	0.19	1.13	1.69	-1.57	-9.60	-1.16*
Inner snem	(2.64)	(0.87)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.18)	(0.93)
Outor shalf	4.97	1.91	0.16	1.08	1.56	-1.49	-9.28	-4.43
Outer shell	(2.06)	(0.52)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.03)	(0.03)	(0.15)	(0.93)
4. Western GoM	12.56	10.21	0.32	1.17	1.70	-1.67	-8.77	-0.96*
shelf	(2.44)	(2.83)	(0.05)	(0.03)	(0.04)	(0.04)	(0.27)	(1.05)
5 Open GeM	6.85	4.27	0.19	1.10	1.59	-1.55	-9.30	-3.79
5. Open GolM	(1.81)	(0.62)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.02)	(0.12)	(0.89)

Table S1. Simulated trends for carbon system variables in the Gulf of Mexico (GoM) and sub-regions as derived from the hindcast experiment (1981-2014): sea surface temperature (SST), sea surface salinity (SSS), surface total alkalinity (sTA), surface dissolved inorganic carbon (sDIC), surface partial pressure of CO₂ (pCO₂), surface pH, surface aragonite saturation state (Ω_{Ar}), and air–sea CO₂ flux. Standard errors are indicated in parenthesis. Main subregions are depicted in Fig. 1c. The northern GoM, West Florida, and Yucatan shelves were divided in inner and outer part (bottom depths 0-25 m and 25-200 m, respectively). Florida inner shelf was further divided in a northern and a southern part. (*) Non-significant trend at the 95% confidence level.

	Mississippi	Atchafalaya	
	Mean values (1981-2014)		
DIC (µmol kg ⁻¹)	2,301 (328)	2,019 (413)	
TA (µmol kg ⁻¹)	2,228 (333)	1,941 (426)	
TA:DIC ratio	0.968 (0.029)	0.959 (0.046)	
	Linear trend	ds (1981-2014)	
DIC trend (µmol kg ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	3.2 (1.3)	3.0 (1.6)	
TA trend (μ mol kg ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹)	5.1 (1.2)	5.6 (1.6)	
TA:DIC ratio trend (yr ⁻¹)	$0.88 imes 10^{-3} (0.14 imes 10^{-3})$	$1.37 \times 10^{-3} (0.21 \times 10^{-3})$	

Table S2. Long term patterns for the Mississippi and Atchafalaya carbon chemistry derived from the U.S. Geological Survey records. Standard errors of the mean values and trends are indicated in parenthesis.

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$								
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		SST	SSS	sTA	sDIC	pCO ₂	pH	Ω_{Ar}
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		[10 ^{−3} °C	$[10^{-3}]$	[µmol	[µmol	[µatm	[10 ⁻³	[10 ⁻³
$\begin{split} \mbox{CLM MC experiment} & \mbox{CLM MC experiment} \\ \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		yr^{-1}]	yr^{-1}]	$kg^{-1} yr^{-1}$]	kg ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹]	yr^{-1}]	yr^{-1}]	yr ⁻¹]
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			CI	LM_MC experie	ment			
	GoM basin	7.9	6.6	0.20	1.09(0.93)	1.60	-1.57	-9.11
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Goin ousin	(1.00)	(1.00)	(0.65)	1.05 (0.55)	(1.02)	(1.03)	(1.05)
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Northern GoM shelf	14.0	22.1	0.49	1.14	1.56	-1.65	-7.28
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Northern Golvi sheri	(1.00)	(1.00)	(0.39)	(0.68)	(1.19)	(1.23)	(1.74)
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	West Florida shelf	10.7	10.6	0.24	1.07	1.66	-1.62	-8.55
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	west Plonda shell	(1.00)	(1.00)	(0.75)	(0.96)	(1.01)	(1.02)	(1.04)
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Vuoatan shalf	5.3	2.3	0.17	1.09	1.59	-1.51	-9.39
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	i ucatali sheli	(1.00)	(1.00)	(1.00)	(1.00)	(1.00)	(1.00)	(1.00)
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Wastern CaMabalf	12.6	10.2	0.19	1.07	1.71	-1.71	-9.23
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	western Gow shell	(1.00)	(1.00)	(0.59)	(0.91)	(1.01)	(1.02)	(1.05)
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline \begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Onen CaM	6.9	4.3	0.16	1.08	1.59	-1.56	-9.41
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Open GoM	(1.00)	(1.00)	(0.84)	(0.98)	(1.00)	(1.01)	(1.01)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			CI	M_RIV experi	ment			
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	0 M1 ·	7.4	4.9	0.18	1.11	1.65	-1.62	-9.57
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	GoM basin	(0.93)	(0.74)	(0.58)	(0.96)	(1.05)	(1.05)	(1.11)
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	N 4 C M 1 10	13.7	7.5	0.20	1.00	1.57	-1.66	-8.41
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Northern GoM shelf	(0.98)	(0.34)	(0.16)	(0.60)	(1.20)	(1.23)	(2.01)
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	West Elsside shalf	11.8	14.3	0.20	1.04	1.74	-1.71	-8.94
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	west Florida shell	(1.10)	(1.34)	(0.62)	(0.93)	(1.06)	(1.08)	(1.08)
Yucatan shelf (0.75) (1.17) (1.23) (1.07) (1.05) (1.04) (1.05) Western GoM shelf11.84.10.161.141.79 -1.76 -9.98 (0.95) (0.40) (0.50) (0.97) (1.05) (1.05) (1.14) Open GoM 6.2 3.7 0.17 1.13 1.64 -1.60 -9.78 (0.89) (0.87) (0.89) (1.03) (1.03) (1.03) (1.03) (1.05) CLM FORC experimentGoM basin 0.1 0.6 0.04 1.06 1.61 -1.57 -10.66 (0.01) (0.09) (0.13) (0.91) (1.03) (1.03) (1.23) Northern GoM shelf 1.5 2.7 0.10 1.03 1.51 -1.61 -9.90 (0.11) (0.12) (0.08) (0.62) (1.15) (1.20) (2.37) West Florida shelf 1.3 2.4 -0.01 1.03 1.72 -1.67 -10.68 (0.12) (0.23) (-0.03) (0.91) (1.05) (1.05) (1.30) Yucatan shelf -0.1 0.5 0.03 1.10 1.68 -1.60 -11.05 (0.02) (0.27) (0.09) (0.96) (0.99) (0.98) (1.27) Open GoM 0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 (0.04) (0.07) (0.16) (0.97) (1.00) (1.00) </td <td>X7 / 1.10</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>0.21</td> <td>1.17</td> <td>1.67</td> <td>-1.57</td> <td>-9.87</td>	X7 / 1.10	4.0	2.7	0.21	1.17	1.67	-1.57	-9.87
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Y ucatan shelf	(0.75)	(1.17)	(1.23)	(1.07)	(1.05)	(1.04)	(1.05)
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	W . O M 1 10	11.8	4.1	0.16	1.14	1.79	-1.76	-9.98
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	western GoM shelf	(0.95)	(0.40)	(0.50)	(0.97)	(1.05)	(1.05)	(1.14)
Open GoM (0.89) (0.87) (0.89) (1.03) (1.23) Morthern GoM shelf 1.5 2.7 0.10 1.03 1.51 -1.61 -9.90 (0.11) (0.12) (0.08) (0.62) (1.15) (1.20) (2.37) West Florida shelf 1.3 2.4 -0.01 1.03 1.72 -1.67 -10.68 Yucatan shelf -0.1 0.5 0.03 1.10 1.68 -1.60 -11.05 Western GoM shelf 0.2 -2.8 0.03 1.07 <		6.2	3.7	0.17	1.13	1.64	-1.60	-9.78
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Open GoM	(0.89)	(0.87)	(0.89)	(1.03)	(1.03)	(1.03)	(1.05)
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		-	CLI	M_FORC exper	iment			
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	C M1 ·	0.1	0.6	0.04	1.06	1.61	-1.57	-10.66
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	GoM basin	(0.01)	(0.09)	(0.13)	(0.91)	(1.03)	(1.03)	(1.23)
Northern GoM shelf (0.11) (0.12) (0.08) (0.62) (1.15) (1.20) (2.37) West Florida shelf 1.3 2.4 -0.01 1.03 1.72 -1.67 -10.68 (0.12) (0.23) (-0.03) (0.91) (1.05) (1.05) (1.30) Yucatan shelf -0.1 0.5 0.03 1.10 1.68 -1.60 -11.05 (-0.02) (0.22) (0.17) (1.00) (1.06) (1.18) Western GoM shelf 0.2 -2.8 0.03 1.12 1.69 -1.63 -11.17 (0.02) (0.27) (0.09) (0.96) (0.99) (0.98) (1.27) Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 (-0.04) (0.07) (0.16) (0.97) (1.00) (1.00) (1.15)		1.5	2.7	0.10	1.03	1.51	-1.61	-9.90
West Florida shelf 1.3 2.4 -0.01 1.03 1.72 -1.67 -10.68 (0.12) (0.23) (-0.03) (0.91) (1.05) (1.05) (1.30) Yucatan shelf -0.1 0.5 0.03 1.10 1.68 -1.60 -11.05 (-0.02) (0.22) (0.17) (1.00) (1.06) (1.18) Western GoM shelf 0.2 -2.8 0.03 1.12 1.69 -1.63 -11.17 (0.02) (0.27) (0.09) (0.96) (0.99) (0.98) (1.27) Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 (-0.04) (0.07) (0.16) (0.97) (1.00) (1.00) (1.15)	Northern GoM shelf	(0.11)	(0.12)	(0.08)	(0.62)	(1.15)	(1.20)	(2.37)
West Florida shelf (0.12) (0.23) (-0.03) (0.91) (1.05) (1.30) Yucatan shelf -0.1 0.5 0.03 1.10 1.68 -1.60 -11.05 (-0.02) (0.22) (0.17) (1.00) (1.06) (1.18) Western GoM shelf 0.2 -2.8 0.03 1.12 1.69 -1.63 -11.17 (0.02) (0.27) (0.09) (0.96) (0.99) (0.98) (1.27) Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 (-0.04) (0.07) (0.16) (0.97) (1.00) (1.00) (1.15)		1.3	2.4	-0.01	1.03	1.72	-1.67	-10.68
Yucatan shelf -0.1 0.5 0.03 1.10 1.68 -1.60 -11.05 Western GoM shelf 0.2 -2.8 0.03 1.12 1.69 -1.63 -11.17 Western GoM shelf 0.2 -2.8 0.03 1.12 1.69 -1.63 -11.17 Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69	West Florida shelf	(0.12)	(0.23)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		(1.05)	(1.30)	
Yucatan shelf(-0.02)(0.22)(0.17)(1.00)(1.06)(1.06)(1.18)Western GoM shelf 0.2 -2.8 0.03 1.12 1.69 -1.63 -11.17 (0.02)(0.27)(0.09)(0.96)(0.99)(0.98)(1.27)Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 (-0.04)(0.07)(0.16)(0.97)(1.00)(1.00)(1.15)		-0.1	0.5	0.03	1.10	1.68	-1.60	-11.05
Western GoM shelf 0.2 -2.8 0.03 1.12 1.69 -1.63 -11.17 Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 Open GoM -0.04 (0.07) (0.16) (0.97) (1.00) (1.00) (1.15)	Yucatan shelf	(-0.02)	(0.22)	(0.17)	(1.00)	(1.06)	(1.06)	(1.18)
Western GoM shelf (0.2) (0.27) (0.09) (0.96) (0.99) (0.98) (1.27) Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 (-0.04) (0.07) (0.16) (0.97) (1.00) (1.15)		0.2	-2.8	0.03	1.12	1.69	-1.63	-11.17
Open GoM -0.3 0.3 0.03 1.07 1.59 -1.55 -10.69 (-0.04) (0.07) (0.16) (0.97) (1.00) (1.15)	Western GoM shelf	(0.02)	(0.27)	(0.09)	(0.96)	(0.99)	(0.98)	(1.27)
Open GoM (-0.04) (0.07) (0.16) (0.97) (1.00) (1.00) (1.15)		-0.3	0.3	0.03	1.07	1.59	-1.55	-10.69
	Open GoM	(-0.04)	(0.07)	(0.16)	(0.97)	(1.00)	(1.00)	(1.15)

Table S3. Simulated surface trends (1981–2014) for sea surface temperature (SST), sea surface salinity (SSS), surface total alkalinity (sTA), surface dissolved inorganic carbon (sDIC), partial pressure of CO₂ (pCO₂), pH, and aragonite saturation state (Ω_{Ar}) derived from the climatological experiments. The ratio between the climatological and hindcast trends is reported in parenthesis.

<i>X</i> :	SST	SSS	sTA	sDIC
$\partial p CO_2 / \partial X$	12.9219	8.7166	-1.2253	1.5264
$\partial \mathbf{p} \mathbf{H} / \partial X$	-0.0150	-0.0130	0.0015	-0.0016
$\partial \Omega / \partial X$	0.0233	-0.0438	0.0112	-0.0106

Table S4. Partial derivatives of partial pressure of CO₂ (CO₂), pH, and aragonite saturation state (Ω_{Ar}) for an average surface condition on the northern GoM shelf during 1981-2014: sea surface temperature (SST) = 24.4°C; sea surface salinity (SSS) = 32.2; surface dissolved inorganic carbon (sDIC) = 1,987 µmol kg⁻¹; surface total alkalinity (sTA) = 2,311µmol kg⁻¹.

	Region	Period	pCO ₂ trend (µatm yr ⁻¹)	pH trend (10 ⁻³ yr ⁻¹)	$\Omega_{\rm Ar}$ trend (10 ⁻³ yr ⁻¹)
Open ocean:					
Present study	Open GoM	1981-2014	1.59 ± 0.02	-1.6 ± 0.0	-9.3 ± 0.1
Kealoha et al. (2020)	Open GoM	1996-2018	Ranging from -0.21 \pm 0.67 to 1.70 \pm 0.14		
Xu et al. (2020)	Offshore South Atlantic Bight	1981-2011	1.38 ± 0.04	-1.3 ± 0.5	-7.3 ± 1.1
Lauvset et al. (2015)	Stratified Subtropical	1991-2011	1.44 ± 0.12	-1.1 ± 0.2	
	North Atlantic	1981-2011	1.42 ± 0.12		
Bates et al. (2014)	BATS	1983-2014	1.69 ± 0.11	-1.7 ± 0.1	-9.5 ± 0.7
Bates & Johnson (2020)	BATS	1983-2020	1.92 ± 0.08	-1.9 ± 0.1	-9 ± 1
Wanninkhof et al. (2019)	Caribbean Sea	2002-2018	1.30 ± 0.03		
Gledhill et al. (2008)	Caribbean Sea	1996-2006			-12 ± 1
Coastal regions:					
Present study	GoM shelves	1981-2014	Ranging from 1.31 ± 0.07 to 1.70 ± 0.04	Ranging from -1.3 ± 0.1 to -1.7 ± 0.0	Ranging from -4.2 \pm 0.6 to -9.4 \pm 0.2
Kealoha et al. (2020)	GoM shelves	1996-2018	Ranging from 0.08 ± 1.66 to 3.20 ± 1.47		
Robbins et al. (2018)	West Florida	1996-2016	4.37		
Xu et al. (2020)	South Atlantic Bight shelf	1981-2011	1.40 ± 0.09	-1.3 ± 0.1	-6.3 ± 1.5
	Mid Atlantic Bight shelf	1981-2011	1.77 ± 0.07	-1.9 ± 0.1	-10.3 ± 1.0

Table S5. Simulated trends and reported trend values for partial pressure of CO₂ (pCO₂), pH, and aragonite saturation state (Ω_{Ar}) in open ocean and coastal regions from the north Atlantic.

Datasets S1 to S7:

Datasets S1 to S7 contain the monthly outputs (January 1981 to December 2014) of sea surface temperature, sea surface salinity, surface alkalinity, surface dissolved inorganic carbon, surface partial pressure of CO₂, surface pH, and surface aragonite saturation state derived from the model hindcast experiment. Each file contains a 3-dimension array (longitude, latitude, time). The horizontal model grid (longitude, latitude) is provided in Dataset S29.

	Variable	Array name	Units
Dataset S1	Sea surface temperature	SST	°C
Dataset S2	Sea surface salinity	SSS	Unitless
Dataset S3	Surface alkalinity	ALK	µmol kg ⁻¹
Dataset S4	Surface dissolved inorganic carbon	DIC	µmol kg ^{−1}
Dataset S5	Surface partial pressure of CO ₂	PCO2	µatm
Dataset S6	Surface pH	рН	Unitless
Dataset S7	Surface aragonite saturation state	OMar	Unitless

Datasets S8 to S14:

As Datasets S1-S7 but for the climatological river experiment.

	Variable	Array name	Units
Dataset S8	Sea surface temperature	SST	°C
Dataset S9	Sea surface salinity	SSS	Unitless
Dataset S10	Surface alkalinity	ALK	µmol kg ^{−1}
Dataset S11	Surface dissolved inorganic carbon	DIC	µmol kg ⁻¹
Dataset S12	Surface partial pressure of CO ₂	PCO2	µatm
Dataset S13	Surface pH	рН	Unitless
Dataset S14	Surface aragonite saturation state	OMar	Unitless

Datasets S15 to S21:

	Variable	Array name	Units
Dataset S15	Sea surface temperature	SST	°C
Dataset S16	Sea surface salinity	SSS	Unitless
Dataset S17	Surface alkalinity	ALK	µmol kg ⁻¹
Dataset S18	Surface dissolved inorganic carbon	DIC	µmol kg ⁻¹
Datacat \$10	Surface partial prossure of CO		uatm
Dataset 319		FCOZ	ματιπ
Dataset S20	Surface pH	рН	Unitless
Dataset S21	Surface aragonite saturation state	OMar	Unitless

As Datasets S1-S7 but for the climatological MARS chemistry experiment.

Datasets S22 to S28:

As Datasets S1-S7 but for the climatological forcing experiment.

	Variable	Array name	Units
Dataset S22	Sea surface temperature	SST	°C
Dataset S23	Sea surface salinity	SSS	Unitless
Dataset S24	Surface alkalinity	ALK	µmol kg ⁻¹
Dataset S25	Surface dissolved inorganic carbon	DIC	µmol kg ⁻¹
Dataset S26	Surface partial pressure of CO ₂	PCO2	µatm
Dataset S27	Surface pH	рН	Unitless
Dataset S28	Surface aragonite saturation state	OMar	Unitless

Dataset S29. Horizontal model grid (longitude, latitude)