A sea change in our view of overturning in the sub polar North Atlantic

Lozier, M. Susan; Li, Feili; Bacon, Sheldon; Bahr, F.; Bower, Amy S.; Cunningham, Stuart; de Jong, M. Femke; de Steur, Laura; deYoung, Brad; Fischer, Jürgen; Gary, Stefan; Greenan, Blair J.W.; Holliday, N.P.; Houk, A.; Houper, Loic; Inall, Mark; Johns, William; Johnson, Clare Louise; Karstensen, Johannes; koman, g

Published in:
Science
Publication date:
2019
Publisher rights:
The re-use license for this item is:
Unspecified
The Document Version you have downloaded here is:
Peer reviewed version

The final published version is available direct from the publisher website at:
10.1126/science.aau6592

Link to author version on UHI Research Database

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the UHI Research Database are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights:

1) Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the UHI Research Database for the purpose of private study or research.
2) You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
3) You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the UHI Research Database

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at RO@uhi.ac.uk providing details; we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Download date: 06. Feb. 2021
Supplementary Materials for

A sea change in our view of overturning—first results from the Overturning in the Subpolar North Atlantic Program

M.S. Lozier\(^1\)*, F. Li\(^1\)*, S. Bacon\(^2\), F. Bahr\(^3\), A. Bower\(^3\), S. Cunningham\(^4\), F. de Jong\(^5\), L. de Steur\(^5\)+, B. DeYoung\(^6\), J. Fischer\(^7\), S. Gary\(^4\), B. Greenan\(^8\), N.P. Holliday\(^2\), A. Houk\(^9\), L. Houpert\(^4\), M. Inall\(^4\), W. Johns\(^9\), H. Johnson\(^10\), C. Johnson\(^4\), J. Karstensen\(^7\), G. Koman\(^9\), I. LeBras\(^11\), X. Lin\(^12,13\), N. Mackay\(^14\)+, D. Marshall\(^10\), H. Mercier\(^15\), M. Oltmanns\(^7\), R.S. Pickart\(^3\), A. Ramsey\(^3\), D. Rayner\(^2\), F. Straneo\(^11\), V. Thierry\(^16\), D.J. Torres\(^3\), R.G. Williams\(^17\), C. Wilson\(^14\), J. Yang\(^3\), I. Yashayaev\(^8\), J. Zhao\(^3\)&

1 Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA
2 National Oceanography Centre, Southampton, UK
3 Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, USA
4 Scottish Association for Marine Science, Oban, UK
5 Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, Texel, Netherlands
6 Memorial University, St. John’s, Newfoundland, Canada
7 GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research, Kiel, Germany
8 Bedford Institute of Oceanography, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada
9 University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA
10 University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
11 Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, California, USA
12 Ocean University of China, Qingdao, China
13 National Laboratory for Marine Science and Technology, Qingdao, China.
14 National Oceanography Centre, Liverpool, UK
15 CNRS, Laboratoire d'Océanographie Physique et Spatiale, Plouzané, France
16 IFREMER, Laboratoire d'Océanographie Physique et Spatiale, Plouzané, France
17 University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

*Correspondence to: mslozier@duke.edu (MSL); feili.li@duke.edu (FL)
‡Current address: Norwegian Polar Institute, Tromsø, Norway
†Current address: University of Exeter, Devon, UK
§Current address: University of Maryland, Cambridge, Maryland, USA

This PDF file includes:
- Materials and Methods
- Figs. S1 to S2
- Tables S1 to S3
- References (44 – 57)
Materials and Methods

1. MOC, MHT and MFT calculations

Details of all calculation methods and of the observing system experiments run to test OSNAP methodology and array design are in Li et al. (14). Here we provide a brief summary.

a. MOC, MHT and MFT definitions

MOC is defined as the maximum of the overturning streamfunction in density space $\Psi(\sigma,t)$:

$$ MOC(t) = \max[\Psi(\sigma,t)] = \max \left[ \int_{\sigma_{\text{min}}}^{\sigma_{\text{max}}} \int_{x_{w}}^{x_{e}} v(x,\sigma,t) \ dx d\sigma \right] \text{ (Sv)}, \quad (S1) $$

where $v$, the velocity field normal to the OSNAP section, is integrated from west ($x_w$) to east ($x_e$) and from the top ($\sigma_{\text{min}}$) across all density surfaces. We choose to calculate the MOC in density space in order to quantify the transformation of waters from one density class to another. The MOC upper (lower) limb is defined as the transport between the surface (bottom) and the density at which the overturning function reaches a maximum.

MHT is defined as:

$$ MHT(t) = \rho C_p \int_{\sigma_{\text{min}}}^{\sigma_{\text{max}}} \int_{x_{w}}^{x_{e}} v(\sigma,t) \theta(\sigma,t) \ dx d\sigma \ [W], \quad (S2) $$

where $\rho$ is potential density, $C_p$ is the specific heat of seawater, $\theta$ is potential temperature, and the double integral is taken over all $\sigma$ surfaces and between the western and eastern boundaries.

MFT is defined as:

$$ MFT(t) = -\int_{\sigma_{\text{min}}}^{\sigma_{\text{max}}} \int_{x_{w}}^{x_{e}} v(\sigma,t) S(\sigma,t) - \bar{S} \frac{\bar{S}}{S} \ dx d\sigma \ [Sv], \quad (S3) $$

where $\bar{S}$ is the area-weighted section mean salinity (34.92 for the whole section, 34.85 for OSNAP West and 34.97 for OSNAP East), and the double integral is taken over all $\sigma$ surfaces and between the western and eastern boundaries. The resultant MFT is an equivalent freshwater transport that can be interpreted as the volume of water at the section-mean salinity needed to balance the salt flux across the section in each 30-day period.

We follow the convention of positive (negative) values indicating northward (southward) volume (MOC), heat (MHT) and freshwater (MFT) transports.

b. Property and velocity fields

Property and velocity fields are calculated on a grid along the OSNAP section. The grid uses a Cartesian coordinate system with the x-axis parallel to the OSNAP line passing through all moorings, the y-axis perpendicular to that line, and the positive z-axis pointing upward. The horizontal resolution of this grid is $\sim 1/4^\circ$ and the vertical resolution is uniformly 20 m.
Mooring data in the boundary arrays are interpolated to estimate the temperature, salinity and density fields in these areas. Away from the arrays, gridded property fields are produced down to 2000 m via an objective analysis method based on temperature and salinity from Argo profiles, OSNAP gliders and moorings, and World Ocean Atlas 2013 (WOA13) temperature (44) and salinity (45) climatology. The WOA13 data are also used in the unmeasured areas on the Labrador and Scottish shelves (Figure 2 of Li et al. (14)). Details on the validation of the objective analysis method can be found in previous studies (14, 37). Below 2000 m, hydrographic data from 407 OSNAP CTD stations occupied during the summers of 2014 and 2016 are used to fill the grid. See complete cruise information at http://www.o-snap.org/observations/research-cruises/.

Mooring velocity data are interpolated to determine the velocity field in the boundary arrays. Away from the arrays, Ekman velocities calculated using ERA-Interim winds (46) are added to the surface Ekman layer, and geostrophic velocities are calculated with two different choices of reference depending on the availability of deep moorings. Where available, directly measured velocities at the top of deep moorings are used to provide the reference, with two exceptions: one in the western Labrador Basin and one in the central Iceland Basin. There, and in areas without deep moorings, the time-mean surface velocity (over the 21-month observational period) from satellite altimetry is used as the reference velocity. Because of the uncertainties of the surface velocities derived from satellite altimetry in the region (e.g., 47, 48), we use the altimetry-derived velocities to calculate a mean reference velocity only. For each time step, we use this mean reference velocity (only in the areas where we have no direct velocity measurements from moorings) and allow a compensation transport (see below) to determine the time-varying barotropic velocity.

For the unmeasured flow on the Labrador and Scottish shelves (see Figure 2 in Li et al. (14)), we use climatological monthly velocities from a high-resolution (1/12°) regional ocean general circulation model. The model is the highest resolution member of the Family of Linked Atlantic Modeling Experiments (FLAME) ensemble that was developed for studying circulation in the Atlantic Ocean (31, 49). We repeated our calculations using climatological monthly velocities instead from a high-resolution (7 km) regional ocean-sea ice model (50) for the unmeasured flow above the Labrador shelf. This choice led to MOC, MHT and MFT estimates with negligible differences in the mean and in the variability. Future work includes improved estimates for these inshore properties and velocities.

c. Net throughflow
Our calculation assumes a zero net meridional mass transport across the entire OSNAP section. Long-term measurements across Davis Strait show a mean transport of -1.6 ± 0.2 Sv from the Arctic into the North Atlantic (51). To account for this transport, and still satisfy a zero-net-mass constraint across the entire section, we allow a transport of -1.6 ± 0.2 Sv across OSNAP West and then allow a compensating transport of the same magnitude but opposite sign across OSNAP East. When calculating the MOC at OSNAP West and East separately, we apply these same constraints.

Alternatively, we can require the net throughflow across the entire OSNAP section to be consistent with a recent estimate of 1.0 ± 0.05 Sv entering the Arctic from the Pacific (52) while keeping the 1.6 ± 0.2 Sv southward net transport at OSNAP West. Using these two constraints, we then apply a northward net transport of ~0.6 Sv across OSNAP East. As such, there is a mass
imbalance across the entire OSNAP section, matching the Bering Strait throughflow. This added constraint has only a minimal impact on the MOC estimate (14.5 ± 0.9 Sv) compared to a zero-net-throughflow across the entire section (14.9 ± 0.9 Sv). The two time series have a root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) of just 0.5 Sv and are strongly correlated (r = 0.997). Thus, for this study, we use the zero net meridional mass transport described above, but we continue to explore the best way to account for Pacific to Atlantic throughflows across the entire section, and OSNAP West and East separately.

**d. Compensation transport**

A compensation transport is added at each time step to ensure a zero net meridional mass transport across the entire OSNAP section (53, 14). That is, we use the constraint of zero net meridional mass transport to identify the fluctuating barotropic component of the flow. The mean compensation transport across the full array and its uncertainty over the observational period is -0.7 ± 3.3 Sv. This mean compensation transport is equivalent to adding a spatially uniform velocity of 0.04 cm/s across OSNAP West and -0.06 cm/s across OSNAP East to those areas without direct velocity measurements. The compensation velocity varies in time: the standard deviation of its time mean is 0.19 cm/s for OSNAP West and 0.44 cm/s for OSNAP East. To test the sensitivity of the MOC estimate to our distribution method, we also applied the compensation velocity uniformly across the whole section, which produced a nearly identical MOC estimate (14.8 ± 0.9 Sv). The two time series are highly correlated (r = 0.99) and have an RMSD of only 0.7 Sv. While a mean compensation transport of just -0.7 Sv is a strong validation of our methods, we continue to work on retrieving more accurate time-varying barotropic velocities and other ways to reduce this compensation transport and its uncertainty.

**e. Mean and uncertainty estimates**

We use Monte Carlo simulations to calculate estimates of the mean fluxes and to provide an estimate of the statistical uncertainty in those means. The statistical uncertainty stems from the intrinsic transport variability and random measurement uncertainty, and is typically dominated by the former (54). We note that all reported uncertainties indicate statistical uncertainty, and do not include possible bias errors, i.e., errors due to biases in Ekman transport or to deficiencies in array design or calculation methodology. A possible bias error of up to ~10% of the mean was found in Li et al. (14) based on Observing System Simulation Experiments (OSSEs) using a global ocean–sea-ice model. Further analysis will be performed for evaluating possible bias error at OSNAP and its sources.

For each 30-day period: We first create a field of variables used for the MOC, MHT and MFT estimates using the local (i.e., at each instrument site) 30-day mean and standard error for each variable at that site. These variables are temperature, salinity, velocity, sea surface height, wind stress, and the net throughflow across the subsection. For each Monte Carlo iteration, we randomly draw from these distributions to produce one realization of MOC (similarly for MHT and MFT). We continue the Monte Carlo iterations until the running mean of the flux estimate converges to within a prescribed value, $\varepsilon$, at which point the standard deviation of the mean has also converged ($\varepsilon = 1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ Sv}$ for MOC, $2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ PW}$ for MHT and $2 \times 10^{-5} \text{ Sv}$ for MFT). We use the average of all iterations as the mean flux for each 30-day period and report the standard deviation of the average as the uncertainty. Uncertainty in the 30-day mean estimates is ~ 4 Sv for MOC (Fig. 3), 0.1 PW for MHT (Fig. 4) and 0.1 Sv for MFT (Fig. 4).
To calculate the standard error of each variable, we divide the daily standard deviation by $\sqrt{30 \text{ days}}/(2\tau)$, where $\tau$ is the integral time scale (days) calculated from the autocorrelation function of the time series (55). We calculate the standard error for each variable at each point on the grid where appropriate. Depending upon the variable and location, $\tau$ ranges from a few days to a couple of months.

**Over the entire 21-month observational record:** To estimate the 21-month mean fluxes, that is the means over the entire observational record, and their uncertainty, we again employ Monte Carlo simulations. For each iteration, we create a 21-month MOC time series from the mean and standard error of each 30-day period, whose calculation is described above. We report the mean and standard deviation of 10,000 Monte Carlo estimates as the final 21-month mean MOC (14.9 Sv) and the corresponding uncertainty (0.9 Sv). The 21-month means and uncertainties for MHT and MFT are similarly obtained.

Alternatively, one can calculate the uncertainty in the 21-month mean as the standard deviation over the entire time period (Table S1) divided by $\sqrt{630 \text{ days}}/(2\tau)$. From the daily MOC time series, $\tau$ is estimated as 16 days, which yields 1 degree of freedom for every 32 days. The uncertainty that results from this calculation is 0.9 Sv, identical to that obtained from the Monte Carlo method.

### 2. Daily MOC estimates

Although daily measurements from all moored instruments are available, the objectively analyzed data product for temperature, salinity and density in the glider domain (see Fig. 2) is generated only every 30 days. The data product in this domain incorporates Argo and glider data, both with insufficient coverage to produce daily estimates. Thus, for our daily time series, we use daily measurements from all moored instruments, yet for the MOC calculation, the same density fields are used over the western flank of the Hatton Bank for each day during each 30-day period. For the MHT and MFT calculations, the same property fields are used in all areas without moored observations for each day during the 30-day period.

To test the extent to which the direct measurements (in the boundary currents) are responsible for the MOC variance at daily time scales, we reran the daily calculation using daily velocities from all moorings, yet we used the 21-month time-mean velocities for areas away from the mooring arrays. This calculation produces a very similar MOC estimate (a 0.7 Sv or ~4% difference) to that produced using time-varying velocities away from the arrays ($r= 0.80$ and RMSD= 3.3 Sv, using 10-day filtered data for both time series). Thus, we conclude that most of the daily MOC variability occurs in the directly measured boundary currents. Nonetheless, we report the MOC mean and uncertainty based on 30-day estimates, and only show the daily values to indicate the scale of variability on that time scale. We continue to refine the spatial and temporal resolution of the objectively analyzed fields so that in the future we will be able to report OSNAP flux estimates at time scales less than 30 days.
3. Alternative MOC definitions and coordinates

Use of potential density and depth coordinates
For the purpose of this study, the MOC is defined as the maximum of the overturning streamfunction in density space. Alternatively, the MOC can be defined as the maximum of the overturning streamfunction in depth space (maxMOC). The MOC using these two definitions is reported in Table S2 and shown in Fig. S1.

Use of neutral density coordinates
We also computed the MOC using neutral density surfaces (56) rather than potential density surfaces and found that the magnitude of the mean estimate was only marginally changed (15.3 ± 0.9 Sv compared to 14.9 ± 0.9 Sv using potential density surfaces; a 3% increase, well within the uncertainty estimate). The variability of the MOC time series created using neutral surfaces is indistinguishable from that using potential density surfaces (i.e., r= 0.996).

4. Decomposition of MHT and MFT into overturning and isopycnal components

The MHT and MFT across each OSNAP section are decomposed into overturning and isopycnal components (e.g, 20) by first defining the total velocity, potential temperature and salinity as:

\[ v(x, \sigma, t) = < v > (\sigma, t) + v'(x, \sigma, t) \] [m s⁻¹], \hspace{1cm} (S4)
\[ \theta(x, \sigma, t) = < \theta > (\sigma, t) + \theta'(x, \sigma, t) \] [°C], \hspace{1cm} (S5)
\[ S(x, \sigma, t) = < S > (\sigma, t) + S'(x, \sigma, t), \] \hspace{1cm} (S6)

where the angle brackets indicate a horizontal average at constant density and the prime indicates deviations from that average.

The MHT across each OSNAP section can then be divided into an overturning, MHT_{overturning}, and ‘isopycnal’ component, MHT_{isopycnal}, (see Fig. 4) as follows:

\[ MHT_{overturning}(t) = \rho C_p \int_{\sigma \min}^{\sigma \max} \int_{x_w}^{x_e} < v > (\sigma, t) < \theta > (\sigma, t) \; dxd\sigma \; [W], \] \hspace{1cm} (S7)
\[ MHT_{isopycnal}(t) = \rho C_p \int_{\sigma \min}^{\sigma \max} \int_{x_w}^{x_e} v'(x, \sigma, t) \theta'(x, \sigma, t) \; dxd\sigma \; [W], \] \hspace{1cm} (S8)

where \( \rho C_p = 4.1 \times 10^6 \; Jm^{-3} \; K^{-1} \), and the double integral is taken over all \( \sigma \) surfaces and between the western and eastern boundaries.

The MFT across each OSNAP section is similarly decomposed:
\[ \text{MFT}_{\text{overturning}}(t) = - \int_{\sigma_{\text{min}}}^{\sigma_{\text{max}}} \int_{x_w}^{x_e} < v > (\sigma, t) \frac{S > (\sigma, t)}{\bar{S}} \, dx \, d\sigma \quad [Sv], \quad (S9) \]

\[ \text{MFT}_{\text{isopycnal}}(t) = - \int_{\sigma_{\text{min}}}^{\sigma_{\text{max}}} \int_{x_w}^{x_e} v'(x, \sigma, t) \frac{S'(x, \sigma, t)}{\bar{S}} \, dx \, d\sigma \quad [Sv]. \quad (S10) \]

The overturning and isopycnal components in density space for both MHT and MFT are shown in Fig. 4. The above decomposition can also be performed in depth space to yield an overturning and horizontal (‘gyre’) component, both shown in Fig. S2.
**Fig. S1.**

**Streamfunction across the OSNAP section.** Streamfunction in density space across the full array (A) and across the OSNAP-W (yellow) and OSNAP-E (blue) subsections (B), and in depth space across the full array (C). The 21 30-day means (thin lines) are shown in all panels, with the MOC (maximum of the streamfunction) denoted for each profile (dot). The 21-month mean streamfunction (thick solid lines in all panels) is obtained by averaging all 21 transport values within each density or depth bin. The potential densities corresponding to the maximum of the streamfunction across the subsections (27.69 kg m\(^{-3}\) for OSNAP-W and 27.53 kg m\(^{-3}\) for OSNAP-E) are slightly different from that derived from the mean streamfunction across the full array (27.66 kg m\(^{-3}\)): with the vertical separation on average are less than \(~100\) m at OSNAP-W and \(~100-200\) m at OSNAP-E. Note that the maximum value (i.e., the MOC) of the mean streamfunction in density space (thick lines in A and B) underestimates the mean of the 21 individual 30-day MOC estimates reported in the main text. Because the density at which the maxima occur varies over the record, the maximum of the averaged MOC streamfunction will be smaller than an average of the maximum MOC streamfunctions.
Fig. S2.  
**MHT and MFT across the OSNAP section.** (A and B) Same as in Fig. 4, but with MHT (A) and MFT (B) decomposed in depth space into overturning (blue lines) and gyre (red lines) components.
Table S1.

Mean transport estimates with one standard deviation over the 21-month period. MHT estimates marked with ‘#’ are temperature, rather than heat, transports since there is a net mass flux across these sections. All reported MFT values are equivalent freshwater transports (14). The standard deviations here reflect the monthly variability over the 21-month period (Fig. 3), not the uncertainty in the estimate of the mean. For the latter, please see Table S3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>MOC (Sv)</th>
<th>MHT (PW)</th>
<th>MFT (Sv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP</td>
<td>14.9 ± 4.1</td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.08</td>
<td>-0.33 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP East</td>
<td>15.6 ± 3.1</td>
<td>0.38± ± 0.08</td>
<td>-0.14 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP West</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.9</td>
<td>0.080± ± 0.016</td>
<td>-0.184 ± 0.041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S2.
Comparison of MOC used in text to an alternative definition. The mean MOC and its uncertainty over the period from August 2014 to April 2016 using different MOC definitions and calculated using 30-day means. The first column is the metric used in the text, where MOC is defined as the maximum of the overturning streamfunction in density space (Figs. S1A and S1B). The second column, maxMOC$_z$, is the maximum of the overturning streamfunction in depth space (Fig. S1C).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOC</th>
<th>maxMOC$_z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP</td>
<td>14.9 ± 0.9</td>
<td>8.0 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP East</td>
<td>15.6 ± 0.8</td>
<td>8.2 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP West</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S3.

Compilation of MOC, MHT, MFT and Ekman transport estimates in the North Atlantic. Reported values are the time mean plus/minus an uncertainty estimate. MOC estimates marked with ‘*’ are those calculated in depth space; otherwise, density space is used. MHT estimates marked with ‘#’ are temperature, rather than heat, transports since there is a net mass flux across these sections. All reported MFT values are equivalent freshwater transports (1/4). Estimates are based on direct measurements from different time periods. The long-term mean RAPID-MOCHA MOC (M15a: 26), MHT (26), MFT (M15b: 57) and Ekman transport (M15a) are for April 2004 – October 2012, while the latest estimate of the MOC and Ekman transport during the overlap period with OSNAP are for 2014 – 2016 (S18: 21). The uncertainties marked with ‘&’ are calculated based on the reported uncertainties in the annual volume (0.9 Sv; M15a) and freshwater (0.02 Sv; M15b) transports. The OVIDE MOC estimate is for 1993 – 2010, while the OVIDE MHT is the mean summer estimate between 1997–2010 (22). There are two MOC estimates at 59.5°N: one is the 2002-2008 mean summer estimate (S12: 29), the other is the long-term mean estimate between early 2012 to early 2016 (R17: 30). The latter study also provided MHT and MFT estimates. The MOC estimated at AR7W is based on either repeat hydrography between 1990-1997 (P07: 23) or Argo floats between March 2002 – April 2016 (H17: 28).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOC (Sv)</th>
<th>MHT (PW)</th>
<th>MFT (Sv)</th>
<th>Ekman (Sv)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP</td>
<td>14.9 ± 0.9</td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.02</td>
<td>-0.33 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.72 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID-MOCHA</td>
<td>17.2* ± 0.3 (M15a)</td>
<td>1.25 ± 0.11 (M15a)</td>
<td>-0.43 ± 0.007 (M15b)</td>
<td>3.8 (M15a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCHA</td>
<td>16.8* ± 0.5 (S18)</td>
<td>1.25 ± 0.11 (M15a)</td>
<td>-0.43 ± 0.007 (M15b)</td>
<td>3.9 (S18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP East</td>
<td>15.6 ± 0.8</td>
<td>0.38± ± 0.02</td>
<td>-0.14 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.51 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVIDE</td>
<td>18.1 ± 1.4</td>
<td>0.51± ± 0.06</td>
<td>-0.14 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.51 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.5°N</td>
<td>18.4 ± 3.4 (R17)</td>
<td>0.399± ± 0.074 (R17)</td>
<td>-0.20 ± 0.04 (R17)</td>
<td>-1.51 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.6 ± 1.1 (S12)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSNAP West</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.080± ± 0.004</td>
<td>-0.184 ± 0.004</td>
<td>-0.18 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR7W</td>
<td>2 (P07)</td>
<td>0.038 (P07)</td>
<td>-0.18 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.18 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1* (P07)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.75 (H17)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9* ± 0.5 (H17)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>