

North Atlantic sea level budget revisited

Zhe Song^{1,2}, Anny Cazenave¹, William Llovel², Andrea Storto³ and Marie Bouih⁴

¹Université de Toulouse, LEGOS (CNES/CNRS/IRD/UT3), 31401 Toulouse, CEDEX 9, France

²Université de Bretagne Occidentale, CNRS, Ifremer, IRD, Laboratoire d'Océanographie Physique et Spatiale (LOPS), IUEM, 29280, Plouzané, France

³Institute of Marine Science, National Research Council of Italy, Rome, Italy

⁴Magellium, 31520 Ramonville St Agne, France

~~Correspondence to~~

Corresponding authors: Zhe Song (zhe.song@univ-brest.fr) and Anny Cazenave (anny.cazenave@univ-tlse3.fr, anny.cazenave@gmail.com)

Ocean Science

~~2nd Revision~~

~~July~~ 3rd revised version

3 September 2026

40 Abstract

41 Based on satellite altimetry, GRACE space gravimetry and Argo-based steric data down to
42 2000m, recent studies have shown that the North Atlantic sea level budget (i.e., altimetry-based
43 sea level minus sum of components) of the past two decades is not closed, with strong regional
44 residuals in the North Atlantic. ~~This was observed but not in~~In this study, we revisit the North
45 Atlantic sea level budget, using satellite altimetry, GRACE and GRACE-FO data, different
46 Argo products and an ocean reanalysis (CIGAR) over the 2004-2022 time span. The ocean
47 reanalysis is used to estimate the manometric contribution, an alternative to using GRACE data,
48 as well as the deep ocean contribution to the sea level budget, not yet fully sampled by Argo.
49 Analyzing different data sets allows us to assess their impact on the previously reported non-
50 closure of the North Atlantic sea level budget. We first find that using the CIGAR ocean
51 reanalysis-based manometric component significantly reduces the residuals of the North
52 Atlantic sea level budget compared to GRACE. We also find that accounting for the deep ocean
53 (below 2000m) thermal expansion (using the CIGAR reanalysis) allows for reducing 30% the
54 North Atlantic budget residuals when using both GRACE and CIGAR for the manometric
55 component. The budget can be closed within the data uncertainties when CIGAR manometric
56 and full depth steric sea level are included.

57

58 1 Introduction

59 While many studies have been devoted to assessing the global mean sea level budget over the
60 satellite altimetry era (1993 to present) (e.g., Barnoud et al., 2021; Bouih et al., 2025; Chen et
61 al., 2020; Dieng et al., 2017; Horwath et al., 2022; Llovel et al., 2023; Nerem et al., 2018;
62 WCRP, 2018), only a few have focused on the regional sea level budget, with mixed results
63 (e.g., Bouih et al., 2025; Camargo et al., 2023; Frederikse et al., 2016; Hamlington et al., 2020;
64 Mu et al., 2024; Royston et al., 2020). ~~At the global scale, the two main contributors to the~~
65 ~~global mean sea level rise are ocean mass (known as barystatic sea level, Gregory et al., 2019)~~
66 ~~and thermosteric change. At regional scale, however, other factors play a non-negligible role,~~
67 ~~such as the halosteric (i.e.,~~At the global scale, the two main contributors to the global mean sea
68 level rise are ocean mass and thermosteric change. At regional scale, however, other factors
69 play a non-negligible role, such as the halosteric (i.e., salinity-related) component, which
70 makes the regional sea level budget more complex to assess. Considering all ocean basins, a
71 recent study (Bouih et al., 2025) investigated the regional sea level trend budget closure over
72 the 2004-2022 time span, using altimetry-based sea level data, GRACE space gravimetry for
73 the regional ocean mass variations (also called manometric component, Gregory et al., 2019)
74 and Argo data for the steric (sum of thermosteric and halosteric terms) component down to
75 ~~2000m~~2000 m (global mean trends removed from all data sets). Bouih et al. (2025) also
76 considered several ocean reanalyses to compute the manometric component (an alternative to
77 using GRACE data), following the approach developed by Camargo et al. (2023), i.e., using
78 the sterodynamic sea level (Gregory et al., 2019) computed by the reanalysis and correcting it
79 for the local steric effect. The Bouih et al. (2025)'s study used the Argo-based product from
80 SIO (SCRIPPS Institution of Oceanography) that corrected for the spurious salinity drift
81 reported recently in some Argo-based salinity measurements (Liu et al., 2020; Ponte et al.,
82 2021; Wong et al., 2023). They showed that in the Pacific, Indian and South Atlantic oceans,
83 the sea level budget trend residuals (altimetry-based sea level minus sum of components) were
84 non-significant, considering the data uncertainties. On the other hand, strong positive residuals
85 were ~~found~~observed in the North Atlantic, whatever the manometric component considered
86 (i.e., either from GRACE or from ocean reanalyses).

87 In the present study we revisit the question of the North Atlantic sea level budget over the
88 2004-2022 time span, using a variety of different data sets for the components of the sea level
89 budget: different GRACE mascon solutions and different Argo-based gridded products down
90 to 2000m, as well as an ocean reanalysis that provide an estimate of the steric signal from the

91 deep ocean. Our objective is to evaluate the impact of each product on the currently reported
 92 non-closure of the North Atlantic sea level budget. An important addition, compared to the
 93 Bouih et al. (2025)'s study, consists of accounting for the deep ocean warming below 2000m
 94 (not sampled by Argo) using estimates from the ocean reanalysis. This paper is organized as
 95 follows. Section 2 presents the data and analysis method. Section 3 displays the results for the
 96 North Atlantic sea level budget, both in terms of trend maps and time series. A synthesis of the
 97 results is presented in the Discussion section (section 4) with some highlights on the few main
 98 messages arising from this study.

99 2 Data and methods

100 2.1 Data

101 2.1.1 Altimetry-based total sea level

102 Sea level variations have been continuously measured by satellite altimetry since 1993. In this
 103 study, we use the daily $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$ gridded sea level anomaly data, version DT2021 available
 104 from the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) (<https://cds.climate.copernicus.eu/>).
 105 ([Copernicus Climate Change Service, Climate Data Store, 2018; Accessed on 15-11-2025](#)).
 106 The data set is further corrected for the TOPEX-A instrumental drift that affected the first 6
 107 years of the time series, ~~but the correction has no impact on our assessment that starts in 2004~~
 108 (Ablain et al., 2017), ~~but the correction has no impact on our assessment that starts in 2004.~~
 109 The Jason-3 radiometer drift that impacts the wet troposphere correction (Brown et al., 2023)
 110 is corrected for. The altimetry data set is also corrected for the absolute Glacial Isostatic
 111 adjustment (GIA) effect, using the ICE6G-D model from Peltier et al. (2018).

112 2.1.2 GRACE-based ocean mass

113 The Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment (GRACE) and GRACE Follow-On (GRACE-
 114 FO) are joint missions by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the
 115 German Aerospace Center (DLR) (Tapley et al., 2019). These satellites have been measuring
 116 temporal variations in Earth's gravity field since 2002. This data set is essential for estimating
 117 mass redistribution in the oceans, terrestrial water storage, ice sheets, and glaciers.
 118 GRACE/GRACE-FO data are generally available in two forms: Spherical Harmonic (SH)
 119 coefficients and Mass Concentration (mascon) solutions. [In Bouih et al. \(2025\), we used, in](#)
 120 [addition to the mascon solutions, an ensemble of 60 SH solutions \(update of Blazquez et al.,](#)
 121 [2018\). The sea level budget residuals based on this ensemble mean SH solution showed a](#)

122 strong north–south signal in the mid-North Atlantic, due to north–south stripe noise affecting
 123 SH solutions (see Blazquez et al., 2018 for a discussion). For that reason, we focus here on the
 124 mascon solutions. In this study, we utilize the latest Release 6 (RL06) mascon solutions
 125 provided by three different institutions: the Center for Space Research (CSR, Save et al., 2016),
 126 the Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL, Watkins et al., 2015), and the Goddard Space Flight Center
 127 (GSFC, Loomis et al., 2019).

128 These mascon solutions, at monthly temporal resolution, are corrected for the geocentric
 129 motion (degree-1) using the Sun et al. (2016) solution. The C_{20} and C_{30} coefficients are derived
 130 from Satellite Laser Ranging (SLR) data. The GIA correction for GRACE is based on the
 131 ICE6G-D model from (Peltier et al., 2018).

132 Additionally, the GAD product derived from AOD1B models (Dobslaw et al., 2017; Flechtner
 133 et al., 2014), which represents non-tidal atmospheric and oceanic mass redistribution, is added
 134 back over the ocean areas to restore the ocean bottom pressure, which combines the effects of
 135 ocean mass and atmospheric loading. ~~For alignment~~ However, to align GRACE data with
 136 altimetry-based sea level ~~data~~ (which are corrected for the inverse barometer ~~effect)~~ , we
 137 ~~remove~~ convert ocean bottom pressure into manometric ocean mass by subtracting the monthly
 138 global ocean-mean atmospheric pressure-atmass from every grid ~~mesh in GRACE/GRACE-~~
 139 ~~FO-ocean-mass-data~~ cell, using the spatial mean of the AOD1B RL06-based GAD product
 140 ~~at~~ corresponding to each ~~month~~ (Chen et al., 2019). ~~In this study~~ mascon solution (Chen et al.,
 141 2019). Note that using the AOD1B RL06 GAD product rather than any updated version is
 142 mandatory to maintain strict internal consistency with the background de-aliasing model
 143 applied during the RL06 mascon processing.

144 Finally, we use the ensemble mean of the three mascon solutions: (CSR, JPL, GSFC) as our
 145 primary manometric product, deriving structural uncertainties from their ensemble dispersion
 146 across the basin (Blazquez et al., 2018; WCRP Sea Level Budget Group, 2018).
 147 The CSR, JPL and GSFC products are provided with 0.25°, 0.5° and 0.5° resolution,
 148 respectively. They are further interpolated on 1°x1° grids.

149

150 2.1.3 Argo-based gridded data

151 The Argo program is an international observational network that deploys a global array of
 152 autonomous profiling floats to measure temperature and salinity in the upper 2000m of the
 153 ocean. Several institutions process the raw data from these floats and publish gridded
 154 temperature (T) and salinity (S) data sets. In this study, we utilize three distinct gridded

products: the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO, Roemmich and Gilson, 2009), the Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC, Hosoda, 2007), and the Met Office Hadley Centre (EN4 product, version 2.2, Cheng et al., 2014). Note that the SIO product rejects salinity profiles exceeding a difference of 0.1 psu when comparing to historical estimate based on the WOCE Global Hydrographic Climatology (Roemmich and Gilson, 2009). This correction tends to ~~withdraw~~remove the salinity drift reported in Argo floats since 2016 (Liu et al., 2020; Ponte et al., 2021; Wong et al., 2023). ~~Note that the~~The other two products do not apply such a correction. All three data products are available at <https://argo.ucsd.edu/data/data-access/> (downloaded in ~~October 2025~~). ~~The thermosteric, halosteric and total steric sea level time series are computed from these gridded temperature and salinity data using the Gibbs SeaWater (GSW) Oceanographic Toolbox (McDougall et al., 2011) which implements the 2010 Thermodynamic Equation Of Seawater (TEOS-10) standard.~~November 2025). The gridded Argo-based time series have a spatial resolution of $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ at monthly interval over January 2004 to December 2022.

169

2.1.4 Ocean ~~reanalyses~~reanalysis

We also used the ocean reanalysis data ~~sets: tCNR~~set CNR-ISMAR Global Historical Reanalysis (CIGAR, Storto and Yang, 2024). CIGAR is a reanalysis system developed by Storto and Yang (2024). Its resolution is $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$. It is based on the NEMO ocean model version 4.0.7 (<https://www.nemo-ocean.eu/>) and is forced by the ERA5 atmospheric reanalysis from the European Center for Medium-range Weather Forecast (ECMWF) (<https://www.ecmwf.int/en/forecasts/dataset/ecmwf-reanalysis-v5>). The system uses a three-dimensional variational (3D-Var) scheme to assimilate in situ T/S profiles from the EN4 data set. Notably, CIGAR does not assimilate satellite altimetry data, which allows for independent comparisons. The system consists of 32 ensemble members generated through varying configurations (e.g., perturbed initial conditions and atmospheric forcing). In this study, we use the ensemble mean of the 32 members to derive the thermosteric, halosteric and steric sea level. Bouih et al. (2025) considered the ensemble mean of five ocean reanalyses over 2004-2019, including CIGAR, to compute the manometric component and showed that this ensemble mean and CIGAR manometric components are highly similar. For that reason, here we only consider CIGAR, but extend it until 2022.

Note that, while the CIGAR reanalysis ingests the same T/S measurements as SIO and EN4 (specifically using the EN4 raw in-situ profile dataset), the reanalysis adopts different quality

control, observational sub-sampling, mapping (horizontal correlation) methods, and vertical propagation. Additionally, in the reanalysis, other factors connected to the model physics (e.g., vertical mixing) and atmospheric and river forcing further shape the time evolution of the ocean state. The reanalysis thus provides a generally different realization of the ocean state evolution than the other products. Vertical covariances and dynamical processes contribute to the evolution of the deep ocean, unlike observation-only products.

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Computation of the thermosteric, halosteric and steric components for Argo data and CIGAR reanalysis

The thermosteric, halosteric, and total steric sea level time series are computed from the gridded temperature and salinity products (both reanalyses and gridded observation products) using the Gibbs SeaWater (GSW) Oceanographic Toolbox (McDougall et al., 2011), which implements the Thermodynamic Equation Of Seawater (TEOS-10) standard. Specifically, 3D density anomalies are vertically integrated to obtain the total steric sea level; thermo- and halo-steric sea levels are obtained similarly, using density anomalies at constant salinity or temperature, respectively (see <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00382-015-2554-9>).

2.2.2 Computation of the manometric component

Manometric sea level change generally refers to the sea-level component associated with ocean mass variations. It is driven by water mass exchange with the continents, such as land ice melt and terrestrial water storage changes, as well as by mass redistribution within the ocean driven by ocean circulation. In this study, because the global mean ocean mass trend is removed, the manometric sea level refers to the regional redistribution of ocean mass around the global mean, ~~with the GRD effect added as described below.~~ In this study, we utilize two methods to obtain an estimate of the manometric component. One method is to use the ensemble mean of the GRACE mascon solutions from CSR, JPL, and GSFC to obtain the GRACE-based manometric estimate. The other method, an alternative to using GRACE solutions, relies on ocean reanalysis data and follows the approach developed by Camargo et al. (2023). Here, we use the sterodynamic sea level provided by the CIGAR ocean reanalysis, which combines steric and dynamic sea level changes. To isolate the manometric component, at every grid mesh, we subtract the local steric ~~effect~~value from the sterodynamic ~~sea level and variable, both being~~ computed at the same grid mesh. We further add the contemporary Gravitational, Rotational,

and Deformation (GRD) fingerprints (representing solid Earth deformations and gravitational effects due to present-day land ice melt and terrestrial water storage changes; Gregory et al., 2019), to obtain a manometric component comparable to GRACE. The sea level fingerprint data used in this study are based on monthly GRD fingerprint grids ~~(0.5°×0.5° resolution)~~ estimated by Adhikari et al. (2019). Since this original dataset ends in 2016, we extended the time series up to 2022 using linear extrapolation, assuming that the observed trend remains constant after 2016 (see Bouih et al., 2025 for details).

This reanalysis-based estimate is hereafter referred to as CIGAR manometric sea level.

As mentioned above, the CIGAR reanalysis assimilates in-situ T/S profiles. This would mean that the steric and manometric sea levels are not fully independent within the reanalysis due to their dynamical interaction. However, the CIGAR-based manometric component is estimated from the sterodynamic variable that includes both ocean mass redistribution estimated by the model and steric contribution (the latter being further subtracted from the sterodynamic variable). Because the reanalysis is free to adjust the partitioning of sea level variations into steric and manometric components according to the ocean physics and the assimilation framework, without altimetry ingestion, the manometric component constitutes a quasi-independent realization.

2.2.2.2.3 Post processing of the data

To ensure spatial consistency across all observing systems, all gridded data sets were spatially interpolated onto a $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ grid and averaged at monthly interval. Post-processing was performed on such $1^\circ \times 1^\circ$ monthly grids. A three-month moving average filter was applied to the corresponding time series. For the spatial analysis, a common mask was applied to all gridded components to exclude regions with high uncertainty. This mask covers latitudes from 66°S to 66°N , excludes inland seas, and omits coastal regions where the distance from land is less than 300 km (see Bouih et al., 2025 for details). ~~Seasonal~~For each data set and at each grid mesh, seasonal signals (annual and semi-annual) are removed from the time series through a least-squares adjustment of 6 and 12-month sinusoids. ~~For the spatial maps, this least-squares fit was used to calculate the trends at each grid point. Finally, as well as~~ the globally averaged trend of each data set computed over the study period ~~was subtracted from each grid point before constructing the spatial trend maps to focus on regional spatial patterns.~~ The study

period spans from January 2004 to December 2022. To allow consistent comparison and budget combination across datasets, all gridded anomaly fields and time series were systematically referenced to a common baseline period (2004–2009) by subtracting their respective temporal mean over this timeframe.

2.2.32.2.4 Data uncertainties

For the altimetry data, we use the uncertainties estimated by Prandi et al. (2021). For the GRACE-based manometric component, uncertainties can be derived from the dispersion of the data sets with respect to the ensemble mean. While formal error estimates are provided with individual mascon solutions (e.g., Watkins et al., 2015), they primarily quantify inversion noise and lack spatial error covariance information, leading to overly optimistic basin-wide uncertainties (< 0.1 mm/yr). Furthermore, as end-users, we have no a priori ground to consider one mascon solution superior to the others. We therefore adopt the ensemble mean of the JPL, CSR, and GSFC solutions as our main manometric dataset. In accordance with established community standards for sea level budget assessments (Blazquez et al., 2018; WCRP, 2018; Barnoud et al., 2021), we estimate the manometric uncertainty from the ensemble dispersion across the three processing centers, which naturally captures the structural processing uncertainty among these equally plausible products.

For the CIGAR-based manometric, thermosteric, halosteric and steric data, the dispersion of the 32 realizations around the ensemble mean was used to estimate the uncertainties.

For the residual time series, the uncertainty was estimated by quadratically summing the error of each term of the budget equation. Regarding the trend uncertainty, it is expressed as the standard error of the least-squares fit. To obtain the uncertainty at the 95% confidence level, we scaled the standard error by a factor of 2 (representing the 2-sigma interval).


3 Results

3.1 Comparison of the different steric products over the North Atlantic

3.1.1 Upper ocean (0-2000m) thermosteric, halosteric and steric products

Figure 1~~Figure 1~~a-d show the thermosteric sea level (TSL) trends over 2004-2022 over the North Atlantic for the three Argo products SIO, JAMSTEC and EN4, and CIGAR (0-2000m) reanalysis data. Similarly, Figure 1~~Figure 1~~e-h shows the halosteric sea level (HSL) trends for

the same data sets and period. As expected, due to thermohaline compensation particularly strong in the North Atlantic (e.g., Pardaens et al., 2011; Wang et al., 2010; Wunsch et al., 2007), the two components display opposite trends. Regarding the thermosteric component (Figure 1a-d), all four products display similar spatial patterns, especially indicating significant positive signals in the western North Atlantic. Regarding the halosteric component, (Figure 1e-h), the four products share similar spatial patterns; however, the magnitude of the SIO product is slightly smaller than the other three in the Northeast Atlantic, the others being very similar. This difference likely results from the SIO processing that corrects for the instrumental salinity drift reported in Argo floats since 2016, whereas the other products do not account for this. The steric sea level (SSL) trends are shown in Figure 1i-l. The magnitude of the total steric change is smaller than that of the thermosteric component alone. This implies that the halosteric contribution plays a significant compensatory role in the North Atlantic (consistent with previous published studies; e.g., Bouih et al., 2025; Llovel and Hochet, 2025). Unlike in the case of the global mean, the influence of salinity changes on sea level cannot be ignored in this region.



300

Figure 1. Trends of thermosteric (a–d), halosteric (e–h), and steric (i–l) sea level change in the North Atlantic (0–2000m depth) over 2004–2022 derived from the SIO (a, e, i), JAMSTEC (b, f, j), EN4 (c, g, k) Argo products and CIGAR (d, h, l) ocean reanalysis.

304

3.1.2 Full depth thermosteric, halosteric and steric products

Here we use the CIGAR reanalysis data to compute thermosteric, halosteric, and steric sea level changes for the deep ocean (below 2000 m). We consider two cases: (1) SIO upper ocean (0-2000) combined with CIGAR deep ocean (below 2000 m). Hereafter it is called SIO hybrid. (2) CIGAR full depth. Trends of thermosteric, halosteric, and steric full depth for SIO hybrid and CIGAR full depth over 2004–2022 are shown in [Figure 2](#). Differences are seen between the two cases in around 20°N [a, c, e](#) for the thermosteric SIO hybrid, and halosteric components [Figure 2b, d, f](#) for CIGAR full depth. Both products display strong positive thermosteric and negative halosteric signals in the western North Atlantic. Small difference is seen for the steric component in the regions of the subtropical gyre between 20°N-40°N, with larger signal near 30°N in the CIGAR full depth case.





Figure 2. Trends of thermosteric (a, b), halosteric (c, d), and steric (e, f) for SIO hybrid (a, c, e) and CIGAR full depth (b, d, f) sea level change in the North Atlantic over 2004–2022.

3.2 ~~Upper ocean Argo based and CIGAR based ocean reanalysis thermosteric~~ Thermosteric, halosteric and steric time series over 2004–2022 from Argo and CIGAR (0–2000m); (global mean trend removed)

Next, we examine the thermosteric, halosteric and steric time series (weighted averages of the gridded data in the North Atlantic) for the different Argo products and the ocean reanalysis product (Figure 3Figure 3). Figure 3Figure 3a indicates that the thermosteric component (0–2000m) displays a positive trend in all products as of about 2010. Regarding the halosteric component (0–2000m) (Figure 3Figure 3b), we observe that the JAMSTEC curve exhibits a spurious positive anomaly between 2008 and 2012, ~~while the~~ The EN4 curve (and to a little extent ~~also SIO and JAMSTEC~~the other two datasets) shows a ~~strong~~ decrease as of 2016, possibly linked to the salinity drift reported in some Argo floats (and not corrected in EN4 and JAMSTEC data-sets, to together with), although a potential physical salinity increase cannot be excluded. The latter issue needs further investigation. In the following, we will only consider the SIO product (as mentioned before, corrected for salinity drift).




Figure 3. Upper ocean time series of thermosteric (a), halosteric (b), and steric (c) sea level time series in the North Atlantic derived from Argo products (SIO, JAMSTEC, EN4). All-time series have applied three-month moving average filtering.

3.3 Comparison of the different manometric components over the North Atlantic


Figure 4a, b, shows the ~~spatial~~ manometric ~~spatial~~ trends in the North Atlantic using the GRACE and CIGAR manometric data. The GRACE-based manometric trends for individual mascon solutions are shown in Figure S1 of the Supplementary Information. All three individual solutions show rather similar large-scale patterns, in particular negative manometric trends in the northeast Atlantic.

Comparing ~~Figure 4(a)~~ and ~~(b)~~, Figure 4b, we distinctly observe contrasting patterns between the GRACE and CIGAR manometric components. For the GRACE-based component, significant negative trends dominate most of the basin, with magnitudes gradually weakening from east to west. ~~However, positive~~ Positive trends are ~~however~~ observed in the western tropical Atlantic. In contrast, the CIGAR manometric component displays positive trends in the east and negative trends in the west, separated by a distinct dividing line, which likely corresponds to the position of the Mid-Atlantic Ridge.

~~Figure 4c,d~~ also shows the ‘Altimetry minus steric full depth’ trends for both the SIO hybrid ~~case~~ and CIGAR cases. These maps are supposed to represent the manometric component, ~~plus the deep ocean contribution.~~ Comparing ~~Figure 4c,d~~ Figure 4c,d, ~~Erreur ! Source du renvoi introuvable.~~ Figure 4a,b, we note a better agreement between ‘Altimetry minus steric full depth’ and CIGAR manometric in the ~~Easterne~~ eastern Atlantic, both maps showing positive trends, while the GRACE manometric trends are negative in this region. On the other hand, it is worth noting that the positive trend area seen in the GRACE manometric map in the western Atlantic around 30°N is also seen in the ‘Altimetry minus steric full depth’ trend map, although with smaller extension, but not in the CIGAR manometric map.

Such comparisons seem point to problems in GRACE data in the eastern North Atlantic region. A recent study by Hightower et al. (2026) revisited the GIA correction applied to GRACE data. They developed a 3D GIA model, considering 3D viscosity fields derived from tomography and two commonly used ice-loading histories. While traditional GIA models assume laterally homogeneous mantle viscosity, these authors show that because the Earth’s rheology varies significantly from place to place, ~~this~~ it strongly affects how the Earth’s mantle rebounds after ice melts, with important impact on the GIA correction applied to GRACE-based ocean mass data in many regions, in particular in the whole Northeast Atlantic. Since here we use GRACE data corrected for the traditional GIA correction, the discrepancy between the GRACE and CIGAR manometric trend maps may result from an inadequate GIA correction.

383



384

385

386 *Figure 4. Manometric sea level trends in the North Atlantic over 2004.01-2022.12 derived from*
 387 *(a) the mean of three GRACE mascon solutions, (b) the CIGAR ocean reanalysis, (c) ‘Altimetry*
 388 *minus SIO hybrid’ and (d) ‘Altimetry minus CIGAR full depth’.*

389

390 **3.4** **3.4** *Residual trend maps in the North Atlantic*

391 In this section, we utilize data from the observing systems described above to compute spatial
 392 maps of the sea level budget residuals.

393 *3.4.1 North Atlantic budget residuals for GRACE and CIGAR manometric and different steric* 394 *(0-2000m and full depth) components*

395 We ~~computed~~compute the residuals by subtracting various combinations of manometric
 396 (GRACE, CIGAR) and steric (SIO and CIGAR, upper 2000 m and full depth) components
 397 from the altimetry data (Figure 5~~Figure 5~~).

398 In Figure 5~~Figure 5~~a,b,e,f (upper ocean steric component), the residuals implicitly include the
 399 deep ocean steric contribution. As previously observed by Bouih et al. (2025), strong residuals

are seen in the Northeast Atlantic with GRACE, and in the Northwest Atlantic with CIGAR. When the deep ocean accounted for (Figure 5c,d,g,h), strong residuals are still seen in the Northeast Atlantic with GRACE, while the residual signal is much attenuated with CIGAR. Indeed, when using the CIGAR manometric component, the residuals decrease significantly in both spatial variability and magnitude.




Figure 5. Maps of sea level residuals (mm/yr) in the North Atlantic. The residuals are calculated by subtracting manometric and steric components from satellite altimetry. The manometric component is derived from GRACE (a–d) and CIGAR (e–h). The steric component from SIO (a, e), SIO hybrid CIGAR DO (b, f), CIGAR UP (upper ocean, c, g) and CIGAR full depth (d, h).

To quantify the residual trends, we computed the latitude-weighted spatial mean trend of each map. Results are shown in **Erreur ! Référence non valide pour un signet.** Table 1. Regardless of the steric data used (whether from SIO or CIGAR), the residuals derived using the CIGAR manometric component are always smaller than those derived using GRACE, for both upper ocean and full depth.

Table 1. Trend values (mm/yr) of sea level residuals in the North Atlantic corresponding to SIO and CIGAR for upper ocean and ~~deep ocean~~full depth, and two manometric components. Uncertainties are 2-sigma errors of the least-squares fit- (before smoothing).

Trend (mm/yr)	SIO	CIGAR	SIO hybrid	CIGAR full depth
---------------	-----	-------	------------	------------------


GRACE manometric	2.15 ± 0.19	1.52 ± 0.21	1.53 ± 0.21	0.90 ± 0.23
CIGAR manometric	1.50 ± 0.23	0.86 ± 0.25	0.88 ± 0.25	0.24 ± 0.22

We note that the mean residual magnitude is reduced when the deep-ocean steric change is included: by about 30% when using the GRACE manometric component with SIO upper-2000 m steric sea level, and by about 70% when using the CIGAR manometric component together with the CIGAR full-depth steric component.

3.5 Time series of the North Atlantic mean sea level budget (global mean trends removed)

~~Figure 6~~ displays the North Atlantic budget time series using CIGAR for the manometric component and two steric full depth configurations. ~~Figure 6~~ shows that the CIGAR manometric component display a changing trend as of 2016, which origin remains to be explained. Because of this behavior, the residual curves are not purely linear. However, Figure 6 clearly shows a larger positive trend with SIO hybrid than with CIGAR full depth. Corresponding residual linear trends amount to 0.88 ± 0.20 mm/yr for the SIO hybrid steric case and 0.24 ± 0.22 mm/yr for the CIGAR full-depth case. In the latter case, we may conclude that the North Atlantic sea level budget is closed within data uncertainties.

441



442

443 Figure 6. Time series of North Atlantic sea level change components (top) and budget residuals
 444 (bottom). The left panels use ~~the SIO~~ hybrid steric estimate (~~SIO for 0–2000m combined with~~
 445 ~~CIGAR for 2000–6000m~~), while the right panels use the full-depth CIGAR steric estimate (~~full-~~
 446 ~~depth~~). In both left and right panels, CIGAR manometric components are considered. ~~All time~~
 447 ~~series have applied three-month moving average filtering~~. The global mean trend of each
 448 component is removed. Shaded areas represent data uncertainties.

449

450 **4** 4. Discussion

451 In this study, we have revisited the sea level budget of the North Atlantic over the 2004-2022
 452 period, using a variety of different data sets. The objective was to further investigate the results
 453 from Bouih et al. (2025) who reported non-closure of the sea level budget in the North Atlantic
 454 over the same time span, and to identify which components of the budget (or which missing
 455 component) are responsible.

456 The main results of our study can be summarized as follows:

- 457 (1) By comparing the GRACE and CIGAR manometric trends with the ‘Altimetry minus steric
 458 full depth sea level’, we note a better agreement (same positive sign) between the latter and the
 459 CIGAR-based manometric component in the northeastern Atlantic, while the GRACE
 460 manometric trends have an opposite (negative) sign in this region. The cause is so far unknown
 461 but possibly related to the GIA correction applied to GRACE data, as shown in the recent study
 462 by Hightower et al. (2026).

(2) Our study shows that the deep ocean (>2000 m of depth) contribution to the North Atlantic sea level budget is not negligible and needs to be taken into account to obtain better closure of the sea level budget in this region. Based on CIGAR, the additional deep ocean steric contribution to the North Atlantic sea level budget allows to almost close the regional sea level budget. (see Table 1). Accounting for the deep ocean steric contribution reduces by a factor of 30% the residuals of the North Atlantic sea level budget when using the GRACE manometric component, and by a factor of 70% when using CIGAR for the manometric component ~~(and CIGAR full depth for the steric component).~~ In the latter case, the mean residual trend over the North Atlantic is <1mm/yr, i.e., of the same order of magnitude as the regional trend error for altimetry gridded data according to Prandi et al. (2021). We ~~can thus~~ therefore conclude that ~~the closure of,~~ almost a small residual remains, the sea level budget ~~holds closure is achieved~~ within the data uncertainties ~~infor~~ for this case.

To conclude, these new findings represent a step further towards better understanding of the present-day sea level budget in the North Atlantic region. These investigations also support the need to better observe the deep ocean especially in the North Atlantic Ocean which is one of the objectives of the One Argo Project (Thierry et al., 2025). Nevertheless, some issues still merit deeper investigation. ~~We can quote~~ This is particularly the ~~followings, among others:~~ Why GRACE case for the manometric ~~data give less good results~~ component which shows opposite trends in the Northeast Atlantic ~~than the~~ when GRACE or CIGAR-based manometric sea level? Which inaccurate correction applied to GRACE is involved? Is it related to are considered. Another important issue concerns the ~~GIA correction applied to GRACE? Can we~~ explain the physical process causing the reported CIGAR-based positive exact contribution of the deep ocean. Use of CIGAR (full depth) steric ~~sea level? What is the impact on the CIGAR~~ steric component estimates of the use of EN4 (with no salinity drift correction applied) in the assimilation procedure? What is the source data improves closure of the ~~(small)-remaining~~ residual trend of the North Atlantic sea level budget ~~(after accounting for the~~ . But whether deep ocean ~~)? warming still plays a significant role needs to be confirmed using Deep Argo~~ data. Clearly, future studies should be devoted to try answering these ~~puzzling~~ remaining questions.

~~Author contributions~~

~~AC, WL and ZS designed the study. All analyses have been performed by ZS. ZS and AC wrote a first version of the manuscript. All co-authors contributed to the discussion of the results, editing and final writing of the manuscript.~~

~~Competing interests~~

~~The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.~~

Acknowledgements

The authors thank ~~two anonymous~~the reviewers for helpful comments that significantly improved the manuscript. Zhe Song is supported by China Scholarship Council. This study is a contribution to the ongoing ESA (European Space Agency) CCI (Climate Change Initiative) project entitled ‘Sea level budget closure CCI+ (SLBC_CCI+)’. This work is a contribution to the GREAT project funded by CNES through the Ocean Surface Topography Science Team (OSTST).

Author contributions

AC, WL and ZS designed the study. All analyses have been performed by ZS. ZS and AC wrote a first version of the manuscript. All co-authors contributed to the discussion of the results, editing and final writing of the manuscript.

Competing interests

The contact author has declared that none of the authors has any competing interests.

Data Availability Statement

All data sets used in this study are publicly available and can be accessed from the following sources. The DT2021 gridded altimetry data set is available at Copernicus Climate Change Service, Climate Data Store (2018).

The Argo-based temperature data used to compute the thermosteric time series come from different sources: (a) SIO, data available from https://sio-argo.ucsd.edu/RG_Climatology.html, (b) JAMSTEC, data available from <http://www.jamstec.go.jp/ARGO/JARGOe.html>, (c) EN4, data available from <https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/hadobs/en4/>.

529 The GRACE, GRACE-FO mascon data are available from Save et al. (2016) for CSR
530 (<http://www2.csr.utexas.edu/grace>), Watkins et al. (2015) for JPL (<http://grace.jpl.nasa.gov/>)
531 and Loomis et al. (2019) for GSFC (<https://earth.gsfc.nasa.gov/geo/data/grace-mascons>).
532 Description of the CIGAR data set, instructions, and data sets are available through the website
533 <https://cigar.ismar.cnr.it>.
534
535

536 References

- 537 Ablain, M., Jugier, R., Zawadzki, L., Taburet, N., Cazenave, A., Meyssignac, B., and Picot,
538 N.: The TOPEX-A drift and impacts on GMSL time series, 2017.
- 539 Adhikari, S., Ivins, E. R., Frederikse, T., Landerer, F. W., and Caron, L.: Sea-level fingerprints
540 emergent from GRACE mission data, *Earth System Science Data*, 11, 629–646,
541 <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-11-629-2019>, 2019.
- 542 Barnoud, A., Pfeffer, J., Guérou, A., Frery, M., Siméon, M., Cazenave, A., Chen, J., Llovel,
543 W., Thierry, V., Legeais, J., and Ablain, M.: Contributions of Altimetry and Argo to Non-
544 Closure of the Global Mean Sea Level Budget Since 2016, *Geophysical Research Letters*,
545 48, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021gl092824>, 2021.
- 546 Blazquez, A., Meyssignac, B., Lemoine, J., Berthier, E., Ribes, A., and Cazenave, A.:
547 Exploring the uncertainty in GRACE estimates of the mass redistributions at the Earth
548 surface: implications for the global water and sea level budgets, *Geophysical Journal*
549 *International*, 215, 415–430, <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggy293>, 2018.
- 550 Bouih, M., Barnoud, A., Yang, C., Storto, A., Blazquez, A., Llovel, W., Fraudeau, R., and
551 Cazenave, A.: Regional sea level trend budget over 2004–2022, *Ocean Sci.*, 21, 1425–1440,
552 <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-21-1425-2025>, 2025.
- 553 Brown, S., Willis, J., and Fournier, S.: Jason-3 Wet Path Delay Correction,
554 <https://doi.org/10.5067/J3L2G-PDCOR>, 2023.
- 555 Camargo, C. M. L., Riva, R. E. M., Hermans, T. H. J., Schütt, E. M., Marcos, M., Hernandez-
556 Carrasco, I., and Slangen, A. B. A.: Regionalizing the sea-level budget with machine
557 learning techniques, *Ocean Science*, 19, 17–41, <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-19-17-2023>,
558 2023.
- 559 Chen, J., Tapley, B., Seo, K., Wilson, C., and Ries, J.: Improved Quantification of Global Mean
560 Ocean Mass Change Using GRACE Satellite Gravimetry Measurements, *Geophys. Res.*
561 *Lett.*, 46, 13984–13991, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL085519>, 2019.
- 562 Chen, J., Tapley, B., Wilson, C., Cazenave, A., Seo, K.-W., and Kim, J.-S.: Global Ocean Mass
563 Change From GRACE and GRACE Follow-On and Altimeter and Argo Measurements,
564 *Geophysical Research Letters*, 47, e2020GL090656,
565 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GL090656>, 2020.
- 566 Cheng, L., Zhu, J., Cowley, R., Boyer, T., and Wijffels, S.: Time, Probe Type, and Temperature
567 Variable Bias Corrections to Historical Expendable Bathythermograph Observations,
568 *Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology*, 31, 1793–1825,
569 <https://doi.org/10.1175/JTECH-D-13-00197.1>, 2014.

- 570 [Copernicus Climate Change Service, Climate Data Store. Sea level gridded data from satellite](#)
 571 [observations for the global ocean from 1993 to present. Copernicus Climate Change Service](#)
 572 [\(C3S\) Climate Data Store \(CDS\). DOI: 10.24381/cds.4c328c78, 2018.](#)
- 573 Dieng, H. B., Cazenave, A., Meyssignac, B., and Ablain, M.: New estimate of the current rate
 574 of sea level rise from a sea level budget approach, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 44, 3744–
 575 3751, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2017GL073308>, 2017.
- 576 Dobslaw, H., Bergmann-Wolf, I., Dill, R., Poropat, L., Thomas, M., Dahle, C., Esselborn, S.,
 577 König, R., and Flechtner, F.: A new high-resolution model of non-tidal atmosphere and
 578 ocean mass variability for de-aliasing of satellite gravity observations: AOD1B RL06,
 579 *Geophysical Journal International*, 211, 263–269, <https://doi.org/10.1093/gji/ggx302>, 2017.
- 580 Flechtner, F., Dobslaw, H., and Fagiolini, E.: GRACE AOD1B product description document
 581 for product release 05, 2014.
- 582 Frederikse, T., Riva, R., Kleinherenbrink, M., Wada, Y., van den Broeke, M., and Marzeion,
 583 B.: Closing the sea level budget on a regional scale: Trends and variability on the
 584 Northwestern European continental shelf, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 43, 10,864–
 585 10,872, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016GL070750>, 2016.
- 586 Gregory, J. M., Griffies, S. M., Hughes, C. W., Lowe, J. A., Church, J. A., Fukimori, I., Gomez,
 587 N., Kopp, R. E., Landerer, F., Cozannet, G. L., Ponte, R. M., Stammer, D., Tamisiea, M. E.,
 588 and van de Wal, R. S. W.: Concepts and Terminology for Sea Level: Mean, Variability and
 589 Change, Both Local and Global, *Surv Geophys*, 40, 1251–1289,
 590 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10712-019-09525-z>, 2019.
- 591 Hamlington, B. D., Gardner, A. S., Ivins, E., Lenaerts, J. T. M., Reager, J. T., Trossman, D. S.,
 592 Zaron, E. D., Adhikari, S., Arendt, A., Aschwanden, A., Beckley, B. D., Bekaert, D. P. S.,
 593 Blewitt, G., Caron, L., Chambers, D. P., Chandanpurkar, H. A., Christianson, K., Csatho,
 594 B., Cullather, R. I., DeConto, R. M., Fasullo, J. T., Frederikse, T., Freymueller, J. T.,
 595 Gilford, D. M., Giroto, M., Hammond, W. C., Hock, R., Holschuh, N., Kopp, R. E.,
 596 Landerer, F., Larour, E., Menemenlis, D., Merrifield, M., Mitrovica, J. X., Nerem, R. S.,
 597 Nias, I. J., Nieves, V., Nowicki, S., Pangaluru, K., Piecuch, C. G., Ray, R. D., Rounce, D.
 598 R., Schlegel, N.-J., Seroussi, H., Shirzaei, M., Sweet, W. V., Velicogna, I., Vinogradova,
 599 N., Wahl, T., Wiese, D. N., and Willis, M. J.: Understanding of Contemporary Regional
 600 Sea-Level Change and the Implications for the Future, *Reviews of Geophysics*, 58,
 601 e2019RG000672, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019RG000672>, 2020.
- 602 Horwath, M., Gutknecht, B. D., Cazenave, A., Palanisamy, H. K., Marti, F., Marzeion, B.,
 603 Paul, F., Le Bris, R., Hogg, A. E., Otosaka, I., Shepherd, A., Döll, P., Cáceres, D., Müller

- Schmied, H., Johannessen, J. A., Nilsen, J. E. Ø., Raj, R. P., Forsberg, R., Sandberg Sørensen, L., Barletta, V. R., Simonsen, S. B., Knudsen, P., Andersen, O. B., Rannald, H., Rose, S. K., Merchant, C. J., Macintosh, C. R., von Schuckmann, K., Novotny, K., Groh, A., Restano, M., and Benveniste, J.: Global sea-level budget and ocean-mass budget, with a focus on advanced data products and uncertainty characterisation, *Earth System Science Data*, 14, 411–447, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-14-411-2022>, 2022.
- ~~Hosoda, S.: Grid Point Value of the Monthly Objective Analysis using the Argo data, <https://doi.org/10.17596/0000102>, 2007.~~
- Liu, C., Liang, X., Chambers, D., and Ponte, R.: Global Patterns of Spatial and Temporal Variability in Salinity from Multiple Gridded Argo Products, *Journal of Climate*, <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-20-0053.1>, 2020.
- Llovel, W., Balem, K., Tajouri, S., and Hochet, A.: Cause of Substantial Global Mean Sea Level Rise Over 2014–2016, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 50, e2023GL104709, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL104709>, 2023.
- ~~Loomis, B. D., Rachlin, K. E., and Luthcke, S. B.: Improved Earth Oblateness Rate Reveals Increased Ice Sheet Losses and Mass-Driven Sea Level Rise, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 46, 6910–6917, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL082929>, 2019.~~
- Llovel, W. and Hochet, A.: Salinity Contribution to Regional Sea Level Trends in the Tropical Southwestern Pacific Ocean Over 2014–2023, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 52, e2025GL116115, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2025GL116115>, 2025.
- ~~Loomis, B.D., Luthcke, S.B. & Sabaka, T.J. (2019) Regularization and error characterization of GRACE mascons. *J Geod* 93, 1381–1398. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00190-019-01252-y>~~
- McDougall, T. J., Barker, P. M., Marine, CSIRO., and Research, A.: Getting started with TEOS-10 and the gibbs seawater (GSW) oceanographic toolbox, Trevor J. McDougall, 2011.
- Mu, D., Church, J. A., King, M., Ludwigsen, C. B., and Xu, T.: Contrasting Discrepancy in the Sea Level Budget Between the North and South Atlantic Ocean Since 2016, *Earth and Space Science*, 11, e2023EA003133, <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023EA003133>, 2024.
- Nerem, R. S., Beckley, B. D., Fasullo, J. T., Hamlington, B. D., Masters, D., and Mitchum, G. T.: Climate-change-driven accelerated sea-level rise detected in the altimeter era, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115, 2022–2025, <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1717312115>, 2018.

- 637 Pardaens, A. K., Gregory, J. M., and Lowe, J. A.: A model study of factors influencing
 638 projected changes in regional sea level over the twenty-first century, *Clim Dyn*, 36, 2015–
 639 2033, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-009-0738-x>, 2011.
- 640 Peltier, W. R., Argus, D. F., and Drummond, R.: Comment on “An Assessment of the ICE-
 641 6G_C (VM5a) Glacial Isostatic Adjustment Model” by Purcell et al.: The ICE-6G_C
 642 (VM5a) GIA model, *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth*, 123, 2019–2028,
 643 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JB013844>, 2018.
- 644 Ponte, R. M., Sun, Q., Liu, C., and Liang, X.: How Salty Is the Global Ocean: Weighing It All
 645 or Tasting It a Sip at a Time?, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 48, e2021GL092935,
 646 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021GL092935>, 2021.
- 647 Roemmich, D. and Gilson, J.: The 2004–2008 mean and annual cycle of temperature, salinity,
 648 and steric height in the global ocean from the Argo Program, *Progress in Oceanography*, 82,
 649 81–100, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2009.03.004>, 2009.
- 650 Royston, S., Dutt Vishwakarma, B., Westaway, R., Rougier, J., Sha, Z., and Bamber, J.: Can
 651 We Resolve the Basin-Scale Sea Level Trend Budget From GRACE Ocean Mass?, *Journal*
 652 *of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 125, e2019JC015535,
 653 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JC015535>, 2020.
- 654 Save, H., Bettadpur, S., and Tapley, B. D.: High-resolution CSR GRACE RL05 mascons:
 655 HIGH-RESOLUTION CSR GRACE RL05 MASCONS, *J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth*, 121,
 656 7547–7569, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JB013007>, 2016.
- 657 Storto, A. and Yang, C.: Acceleration of the ocean warming from 1961 to 2022 unveiled by
 658 large-ensemble reanalyses, *Nat Commun*, 15, 545, [https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44749-7)
 659 [44749-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-44749-7), 2024.
- 660 Sun, Y., Riva, R., and Ditmar, P.: Optimizing estimates of annual variations and trends in
 661 geocenter motion and J 2 from a combination of GRACE data and geophysical models, *J.*
 662 *Geophys. Res. Solid Earth*, 121, 8352–8370, <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JB013073>, 2016.
- 663 Tapley, B., Watkins, M., Flechtner, F., Reigber, C., Bettadpur, S., Rodell, M., Sasgen, I.,
 664 Famiglietti, J., Landerer, F., Chambers, D., Reager, J., Gardner, A., Save, H., Ivins, E.,
 665 Swenson, S., Boening, C., Dahle, C., Wiese, D., Dobs law, H., and Velicogna, I.:
 666 Contributions of GRACE to understanding climate change, *Nature Climate Change*, 5,
 667 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-019-0456-2>, 2019.
- 668 Thierry, V., Claustre, H., Pasqueron De Fommervault, O., Zilberman, N., Johnson, K. S., King,
 669 B. A., Wijffels, S. E., Bhaskar, U. T. V. S., Balmaseda, M. A., Belbeoch, M., Bollard, M.,
 670 Boutin, J., Boyd, P., Cancouët, R., Chai, F., Ciavatta, S., Crane, R., Cravatte, S., Dall’Olmo,

- 671 G., Desbruyères, D., Durack, P. J., Fassbender, A. J., Fennel, K., Fujii, Y., Gasparin, F.,
 672 González-Santana, A., Gourcuff, C., Gray, A., Hewitt, H. T., Jayne, S. R., Johnson, G. C.,
 673 Kolodziejczyk, N., Le Boyer, A., Le Traon, P.-Y., Llovel, W., Lozier, M. S., Lyman, J. M.,
 674 McDonagh, E. L., Martin, A. P., Meyssignac, B., Mogensen, K. S., Morris, T., Oke, P. R.,
 675 Smith, W. O., Owens, B., Poffa, N., Post, J., Roemmich, D., Rykaczewski, R. R.,
 676 Sathyendranath, S., Scanderbeg, M., Scheurle, C., Schofield, O., Von Schuckmann, K.,
 677 Scourse, J., Sprintall, J., Suga, T., Tonani, M., Van Wijk, E., Xing, X., and Zuo, H.:
 678 Advancing ocean monitoring and knowledge for societal benefit: the urgency to expand
 679 Argo to OneArgo by 2030, *Front. Mar. Sci.*, 12, 1593904,
 680 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2025.1593904>, 2025.
- 681 Wang, C., Dong, S., and Munoz, E.: Seawater density variations in the North Atlantic and the
 682 Atlantic meridional overturning circulation, *Clim Dyn*, 34, 953–968,
 683 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-009-0560-5>, 2010.
- 684 Watkins, M. M., Wiese, D. N., Yuan, D.-N., Boening, C., and Landerer, F. W.: Improved
 685 methods for observing Earth’s time variable mass distribution with GRACE using spherical
 686 cap mascons, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth*, 120, 2648–2671,
 687 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JB011547>, 2015.
- 688 WCRP: Global sea-level budget 1993–present, *Earth System Science Data*, 10, 1551–1590,
 689 <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-10-1551-2018>, 2018.
- 690 Wong, A. P. S., Gilson, J., and Cabanes, C.: Argo salinity: bias and uncertainty evaluation,
 691 *Earth System Science Data*, 15, 383–393, <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-15-383-2023>, 2023.
- 692 Wunsch, C., Ponte, R. M., and Heimbach, P.: Decadal Trends in Sea Level Patterns: 1993–
 693 2004, *Journal of Climate*, 20, 5889–5911, <https://doi.org/10.1175/2007JCLI1840.1>, 2007.
- 694
 695
 696