

2 **Fractional Solubility of Aerosol Iron: Synthesis of a Global-Scale Data Set**

3

4 Edward R. Sholkovitz

5 Department of Marine Chemistry and Geochemistry, Woods Hole Oceanographic

6 Institution, Woods Hole, MA 02541, USA

7

8 Peter N. Sedwick

9 Department of Ocean, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Old Dominion University,

10 Norfolk, VA 23529, USA

11

12 Thomas M. Church

13 School of Marine Science and Policy, University of Delaware,

14 Newark, DE 19716, USA

15

16 Alexander R. Baker and Claire F. Powell

17 School of Environmental Sciences

18 University of East Anglia

19 Norwich NR4 7TJ, UK

20

1 **Abstract**

2 Aerosol deposition provides a major input of the essential micronutrient iron to
3 the open ocean. A critical parameter with respect to biological availability is the
4 proportion of aerosol iron that enters the oceanic dissolved iron pool – the so-called
5 fractional solubility of aerosol iron (%Fe_S). Here we present a global-scale compilation
6 of total aerosol iron loading (Fe_T) and estimated %Fe_S values for ~1100 samples
7 collected over the open ocean, the coastal ocean, and some continental sites, including a
8 new data set from the Atlantic Ocean. Despite the wide variety of methods that have
9 been used to define 'soluble' aerosol iron, our global-scale compilation reveals a
10 remarkably consistent trend in the fractional solubility of aerosol iron as a function of
11 total aerosol iron loading, with the great bulk of the data defining an hyperbolic trend.
12 The hyperbolic trends that we observe for both global- and regional-scale data are
13 adequately described by a simple two-component mixing model, whereby the fractional
14 solubility of iron in the bulk aerosol reflects the conservative mixing of 'lithogenic'
15 mineral dust (high Fe_T and low %Fe_S) and non-lithogenic 'combustion' aerosols (low Fe_T
16 and high %Fe_S). An increasing body of empirical and model-based evidence points to
17 anthropogenic fuel combustion as the major source of these non-lithogenic 'combustion'
18 aerosols, implying that human emissions are a major determinant of the fractional
19 solubility of iron in marine aerosols. The robust global-scale relationship between %Fe_S
20 and Fe_T provides a simple heuristic method for estimating aerosol iron solubility at the
21 regional to global scale.

22

23

1. INTRODUCTION

Iron (Fe) is a limiting nutrient for phytoplankton growth in many regions of the world's ocean. The atmosphere represents a major source of particulate and dissolved iron to the open-ocean, via the dry and wet deposition of aerosols (Duce and Tindale, 1991; Duce et al., 1991; Jickells and Spokes, 2001; Ussher et al., 2004; Jickells et al., 2005; Mahowald et al., 2009; Baker and Croot, 2010; Breitbarth et al., 2010; Raiswell and Canfield, 2012). The atmospheric transport and deposition of mineral dust from arid regions of Africa, Asia, South America and Australia is thought to provide a major source of 'new' soluble iron to the upper ocean, where soluble iron is defined as that which contributes to the dissolved iron inventory of surface seawater. In evaluating the atmospheric input of soluble iron to the ocean, a critical parameter is the so-called fractional solubility of aerosol iron, $\%Fe_S$, which is defined in this paper as $Fe_S/Fe_T \times 100$, where Fe_S and Fe_T are the atmospheric loadings of soluble aerosol Fe and total aerosol Fe, respectively. The largest contributor to iron-bearing aerosols that enter the ocean is thought to be continental soils, for which the fractional solubility of Fe is typically ~1% or less (Jickells and Spokes, 2001; Jickells et al., 2005; Mahowald et al., 2009). However, numerous studies have reported much higher values for the fractional solubility of iron in natural aerosols, which have variously been ascribed to chemical alteration of lithogenic dust during atmospheric transport, and/or an inherently higher solubility of iron in aerosols derived from natural and anthropogenic combustion processes (Zhuang et al., 1990, 1992b; Chester et al., 1993; Zhu et al., 1993; Siefert et al., 1996; Jickells and Spokes, 2001; Chen and Siefert, 2004; Desboeufs et al., 2005; Guieu et al., 2005; Hsu et al., 2005; Baker et al., 2006a; Buck et al., 2006, 2010a; Sedwick et al.,

1 2007; Aguilar-Islas et al., 2010; Kumar and Sarin, 2010; Mori et al., 2011; Theodosi et
2 al., 2010a; Trapp et al., 2010; and Supplementary Tables S1 and S2).

3 In this paper, we present a new and extensive compilation of aerosol iron
4 solubility estimates for samples collected around the globe, and use these data to argue
5 that the fractional solubility of aerosol iron entering the ocean can be significantly higher
6 than the values of ~1% that are typical of lithogenic soil dust, due largely to contributions
7 from anthropogenic combustion emissions. Two previous studies provide the foundation
8 for this paper. The first is the report of Chuang et al. (2005), who show that the water
9 soluble fraction of iron in aerosols collected in the Asian continental outflow increases
10 from ~0.1% to ~10% in direct proportion to the aerosol concentration of black carbon,
11 which led them to conclude that the solubility of aerosol iron was related to
12 anthropogenic emissions, as traced by elemental carbon. Second is the study by Sedwick
13 et al. (2007) in the Sargasso Sea, who report that the fractional solubility of iron in
14 aerosols carried in North American air masses (up to 19%) greatly exceeds that of
15 Saharan dust that is transported from North Africa (~0.5%), and conclude that the
16 fractional solubility of iron in the bulk aerosol is controlled by the relative proportions of
17 lithogenic mineral dust and anthropogenic aerosols. The conclusions of these two
18 empirical studies are supported by the results of subsequent modeling studies, which
19 suggest that combustion emissions contribute a significant fraction of the total aeolian
20 input of soluble iron to the surface ocean, although the model results are strongly
21 dependent on the values assigned for the fractional solubility of iron in lithogenic and
22 combustion aerosols (Sedwick et al., 2007; Luo et al., 2008; Mahowald et al., 2009;
23 Sholkovitz et al., 2009).

1 We have compiled data from the literature to provide estimates of the fractional
2 solubility of iron in aerosols collected from open-ocean and coastal environments, as well
3 as from several continental sites (see Supplementary Table S1). This compilation
4 provides access to a large set of data on the fractional solubility of aerosol iron and total
5 aerosol iron loading for a diverse range of oceanic regions (Figs. 1 and 2). Despite the
6 range of different methods that have been used to estimate %Fe_S values, the combined
7 data set reveals a remarkable systematic trend in %Fe_S vs. Fe_T, which should prove useful
8 for modelers who seek to incorporate the atmospheric deposition of soluble iron into
9 numerical models of ocean biogeochemistry and ecology (e.g., Fung et al., 2000; Hand et
10 al., 2004; Moore et al., 2004; Parekh et al., 2004; Luo et al., 2005, 2008; Mahowald et al.,
11 2005, 2009, 2011, Meskhidze et al., 2005; Fan et al., 2006; Moore and Doney, 2007;
12 Moore and Braucher, 2008; Krishnamurthy et al., 2009; Tagliabue et al., 2009; Luo and
13 Gao, 2010, Okin et al., 2011).

14

15 **2. COMPENDIUM OF DATA FOR ATMOSPHERIC LOADING AND** 16 **FRACTIONAL SOLUBILITY OF AEROSOL IRON**

17 Supplementary material for this paper is archived and freely available at
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1575/1912/5104> in the Woods Hole Open Access Server (WHOAS).
19 This material consists of three tables (S1, S2 and S3), and a ‘Readme’ file that provides a
20 detailed description of the contents of these tables. Table S1 is a compilation of ~ 1100
21 *paired data* for total aerosol iron loading (Fe_T) and the fractional solubility of aerosol
22 iron (%Fe_S) for aerosols collected at oceanic sites around the globe (Figs. 1 and 2).
23 Figures 3-9 use the data in Table S1. Table S1 and the Readme file include information

1 on sample locations, collection dates, and methods of collection and **storage**, as well as
2 the leaching protocols that were used to define 'soluble' aerosol iron (Fe_S) in each of the
3 26 studies. Table S1 also contains two relatively large sets of previously unpublished
4 data, for aerosol samples collected from: (1) Bermuda and the adjacent Sargasso Sea
5 during 2007 and 2008 (93 samples; T.M. Church, P.N. Sedwick and E.R. Sholkovitz,
6 unpublished data); and (2) the North and South Atlantic Ocean during 2003-2008 (291
7 samples; A.R. Baker and C.F. Powell, unpublished data). Previous overviews of the
8 fractional solubility of iron in marine aerosols (and in rain water in some cases) have
9 been provided by Jickells and Spokes (2001), Hand et al. (2004), Mahowald et al. (2005),
10 Fan et al. (2006), Aguilar-Islas et al. (2010), Moxim et al. (2011) and Srinivas et al.
11 (2011). These publications only present the range of $\% \text{Fe}_S$ values reported in the
12 literature.

13 Table S2 contains additional data on the fractional solubility of Fe in aerosols and
14 soils derived from 28 published papers: Hodge et al. (1978); Crecelius (1980); Hardy and
15 Crecelius (1981); Breslin and Duedall (1987); Zhen et al., (1992); Chester et al. (1993);
16 Spokes et al., (1994); Spokes and Jickells (1996); Jickells (1999); Jickells and Spokes
17 (2001); Bonnet and Guieu (2004); Desboeufs et al. (2005); Mackie et al., (2006);
18 Cwiertny et al. (2008); Duvall et al. (2008); Journet et al., (2008); Wagener et al. (2008);
19 Schroth et al. (2009); Hsu et al. (2010); Ooki et al. (2009); Buck et al. (2010b); Mendez
20 et al. (2010); Oakes et al. (2010); Paris et al. (2010); Theodosi et al. (2010a); Mori et al.
21 (2011); Shi et al. (2011); Upadhyay et al. (2011). Table S2 differs from Table S1 in that
22 the majority of papers included in Table S2 report data for the fractional solubility of
23 aerosol iron ($\% \text{Fe}_S$), but not for total aerosol iron loading (Fe_T). Table S2 also provides

1 information on collection dates, locations, and sample types, as well as the protocols that
2 were used to define soluble aerosol iron. Lastly, Table S3 presents details of the two end-
3 member mixing model and the model results for eight case studies in which we have
4 calculated %Fe_S as a function of Fe_T for various mixtures of possible aerosol end-
5 members (see Fig. 10A).

6

7 **3. AEROSOL COLLECTION AND SOLUBILITY PROTOCOLS**

8 When comparing data on aerosol iron solubility derived from studies carried out
9 around the globe, it is important to note that there are significant differences in the dates
10 of aerosol collection, in collection and storage methods, and in leaching techniques and
11 leaching solutions that have been used to define 'soluble' aerosol iron. Hence, we might
12 expect that a global-scale comparison of aerosol iron solubility vs. total aerosol iron
13 loading would be fraught with problems, as a result of the wide range of sampling and
14 sample processing protocols that have been employed. However, as will be shown in this
15 paper, the combined data reveal a remarkable systematic trend over regional and global
16 scales that appears to dominate any effects due to methodological differences.

17 The paired %Fe_S and Fe_T data in our compilation correspond to aerosol samples
18 that were collected during different seasons over a period of more than two decades. The
19 majority of samples were collected between 1991 and 2008 on ships at sea, as well as at
20 several island and continental sites. Both high- and low-volume vacuum filtration
21 systems were employed, using filters that include a range of different materials,
22 dimensions and pore sizes. In some of the studies, the aerosol samples were leached
23 within hours of collection, whereas in other cases, the aerosol-laden filters were frozen

1 and transported back to the home laboratories for leaching. The former include nine
2 studies (sites 3, 4, 12, 18-22, and 26 in Fig. 1), and latter include twelve studies (sites 1,
3 2, 9-11, 13-17, 24 and 25). In five studies, it is not clear how the samples were stored
4 prior to leaching (sites 5-8 and 23).

5 The leaching procedures also include a wide range of different techniques and
6 solutions. Three main leaching techniques have been employed: 'batch' leaching, 'flow-
7 through' leaching, and a combination of these two methods. The most frequently used
8 technique is batch leaching, wherein a section of aerosol-laden filter is placed in a
9 container containing the leaching solution for some fixed period of time, after which the
10 solution is filtered for subsequent analysis of the operationally-defined 'soluble Fe' in the
11 filtrate. Some studies have used ultrasonic agitation in the batch leaching method. In the
12 flow-through method, the aerosol-laden filter is typically mounted in a filtration tower, or
13 placed above a secondary filter membrane, and the leaching solution is then added and
14 drawn through the filter using either gas overpressure or vacuum.

15 Wu et al. (2007) and Aguilar-Islas et al. (2010) have applied a 'semi-continuous
16 leaching method', which combines features of the batch and flow-through methods: an
17 aerosol-laden filter is placed in a filtration tower above a secondary filter membrane, and
18 several successive aliquots of leaching solution are added and filtered after some given
19 dissolution period. Buck et al. (2006) and Wu et al. (2007) have argued that the flow-
20 through leaching protocol (compared with the batch-wise leaching method) alleviates the
21 potential for precipitation of iron oxyhydroxides prior to collection of the leachate
22 (filtrate) solution, because aerosol particles are continuously exposed to added 'fresh'
23 solution during the leaching process, thus it is unlikely that the leachate solution reaches

1 saturation with respect to iron oxyhydroxides prior to passing through the filter
2 membrane. For all three leaching techniques, the mass of aerosol that is leached varies
3 considerably. Both the leaching times and the particle:leach solution mass ratios are also
4 highly variable between the batch methods used by different groups. Likewise, there are
5 significant differences in the aerosol sample masses, and the volumes and flow rates of
6 the leaching solutions used in the flow-through methods. In addition, different types of
7 filters have been used to filter the leach solutions that are collected for the measurement
8 of the thus-defined soluble iron.

9 Four types of leaching solutions have been most commonly used. Ultrapure
10 deionized water (Milli-Q or similar, pH ~5.5, resistivity $\geq 18 \text{ M}\Omega \text{ cm}$) was used by
11 Chuang et al. (2005), Chen et al. (2006), Hsu et al., (2009), Kumar and Sarin (2010) and
12 Kumar et al. (2010) with the batch-leaching method, and by Buck et al. (2006, 2010a),
13 Sedwick et al. (2007), Aguilar-Islas et al. (2010) and Church et al. (unpublished data in
14 this paper) with the flow-through leaching method. Filtered seawater (ambient pH ~8)
15 was used by Chen et al. (2006) and Hsu et al. (2009) with the batch-leaching method, by
16 Buck et al. (2006, 2010a) with the flow-through leaching method, and by Wu et al.
17 (2007) and Aguilar-Islas et al. (2010) with the combined batch and flow-through leaching
18 method. Six studies (Siefert et al., 1996, 1999; Johansen et al., 2000; Johansen and
19 Hoffman, 2003; Chen, 2004; Chen and Siefert, 2004) have made use of a pH 4.2-4.5
20 buffered solution of formate with the batch-leaching method (details in Chen and Siefert,
21 2003). A large data set from the University of East Anglia researchers was obtained
22 using a pH 4.7 buffered solution of ammonium acetate with the batch-leaching method

1 (Baker et al., 2006a, 2006b; Witt et al., 2006, 2010; Powell and Baker, unpublished data
2 in this paper).

3 Finally, four studies have employed mild to moderately strong mineral acids with
4 the batch leaching method (Zhuang et al., 1992a; Zhu et al., 1997; Witt et al., 2006, 2010;
5 Cwiertny et al., 2008). In general, and not unexpectedly, the results of these few studies
6 yielded %Fe_s values that are significantly higher than values reported by other groups
7 that have used less acidic leaching solutions. For example, Cwiertny et al. (2008) report
8 unusually high %Fe_s values (4-16%) for desert and loess soils of Africa and Asia when
9 using a batch leaching method with pH 1 leach solutions of HCl, HNO₃ and H₂SO₄
10 (Table S2). Such relatively acidic leach solutions are likely to solubilize some of the
11 lattice-bound iron contained in clay minerals in the aerosols.

12 Deionized water was used as a leaching solution with a flow-through aerosol
13 leaching method by Buck et al. (2006) and Sedwick et al. (2007), who have argued that
14 such high-purity water provides a consistent and reproducible leaching solution, thus
15 facilitating comparison between the results of different field studies and different
16 investigators. Buck et al. (2010a) have further suggested that leaching aerosols with
17 deionized water at a pH of ~ 5.5 mimics the dissolution of aerosol iron in wet deposition.
18 Similarly, numerous studies have performed aerosol leaches using either formate- or
19 acetate-based buffer solutions with pH ~ 4.2-4.7, with the rationale that such solutions
20 simulate the conditions of marine precipitation. The use of seawater as an aerosol
21 leaching solution has been relatively limited (Hsu et al., 2005; Buck et al., 2006, 2010a,b;
22 Chen et al., 2006; Wu et al., 2007; Aguilar-Islas et al., 2010). A major concern in using
23 seawater is that natural variations in the nature and concentration of dissolved Fe and Fe-

1 binding organic ligands may lead to inconsistent and irreproducible results (Mendez et
2 al., 2010). In contrast to the most commonly used mildly acidic leach solutions, seawater
3 is mildly basic (pH ~ 8) and has high ionic strength (~0.7 M). In this regard, the use of
4 seawater as a leach solution does not mimic the dissolution of aerosol iron in rainwater,
5 although seawater leaches may provide the closest analog for the dissolution of dry
6 aerosols in the surface ocean.

7 Most of the studies that we have included in our data compilation report total
8 soluble aerosol iron (Fe_S). A smaller number of studies, particularly those that have used
9 formate as the leaching solution, have reported soluble Fe(II), and in some cases soluble
10 Fe(III). In reporting values for the fractional solubility of aerosol iron ($\%Fe_S$), we have
11 chosen not to distinguish between the oxidation states of the operationally defined soluble
12 aerosol iron. In cases where both oxidation states of iron are reported, we have summed
13 these concentrations to calculate Fe_S and $\%Fe_S$. Where only soluble Fe(II) or total Fe(II)
14 data are reported, we have used those data to calculate $\%Fe_S$ and Fe_T , respectively. For
15 those papers that report Fe data for both fine and coarse aerosol fractions, we have
16 summed the soluble and total iron in these fractions (see Supplementary Table S1; Siefert
17 et al., 1999; Johansen et al., 2000; Johansen and Hoffman, 2003; Chen, 2004; and Chen
18 and Siefert, 2004).

19 **4. RESULTS**

20 **4.1. Aerosol samples: field data**

21 Variation in the fractional solubility of aerosol iron ($\%Fe_S$) as a function of total
22 aerosol iron loading (Fe_T) is the primary focus of this paper, with scatter plots of $\%Fe_S$
23 versus Fe_T from various studies constituting the core results (Figs. 3-9). We will begin

1 with a description of the full set of the globally-distributed samples (Fig. 3), and then
2 focus on five different regions: the Indian Ocean/coastal Asia (Fig. 4); the Atlantic Ocean
3 (Figs. 5 and 6); the Pacific Ocean (Fig. 7); the Gulf of Aqaba (Fig. 8); and the Southern
4 Hemisphere ocean (Fig. 9). With the exception of Figs. 7 and 9, our scatter plots include
5 an insert showing expanded x and y scales, which allows the reader to focus on the lower
6 end of the Fe_T range, where the greatest variation in $\%Fe_S$ is typically observed. Data
7 from the Sargasso Sea (site 21; Sedwick et al., 2007) are used as a benchmark for
8 comparisons with the global and regional data sets; as such, the Sargasso Sea data for
9 $\%Fe_S$ and Fe_T are included in most of the figures. Plots of $\%Fe_S$ vs. Fe_T for individual
10 sample sites can be found in Table S1.

11 The global-scale compilation reveals a consistent trend in the fractional solubility
12 of aerosol iron as a function of total aerosol iron loading, with the great bulk of the data
13 defining an hyperbolic trend for $\%Fe_S$ vs. Fe_T (Fig. 3A and 3B). Remarkably, this clear
14 trend is evident despite the wide range of differences in the dates and locations of aerosol
15 sampling, in the aerosol collection and storage methods, and in the leaching methods and
16 solutions used to define Fe_S (as described in Section 3). In detail, the total aerosol iron
17 loadings range from $\sim 5 \text{ ng Fe m}^{-3}$ to $\sim 17,000 \text{ ng Fe m}^{-3}$. High Fe_T values are typically
18 associated with 'dusty' conditions off the coasts of West Africa and South Korea, whereas
19 the low values come from the remote regions of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans,
20 including the Southern Ocean south of Tasmania (Figs. 2 and 9; Bowie et al., 2009).
21 Estimates of the fractional solubility of aerosol iron range from near zero to more than
22 95%, with most samples yielding $\%Fe_S$ values less than 50%. The great majority of
23 samples with Fe_T above 500 ng m^{-3} have corresponding $\%Fe_S$ values less than 2%. The

1 highest %FeS values are associated with low Fe_T values, although not all samples with
2 low total loading exhibit elevated values of %Fe_S. The expanded scales in Figure 3B
3 show that much of the variability in the full global data set, namely the high %Fe_S values
4 between Fe_T values of 100 and 1000 ng Fe m⁻³, is associated with samples collected from
5 three coastal regions – the Gulf of Aqaba (site 5), the East China Sea (site 7) and South
6 Korea (site 8) – or from the continental United States (site 14). As we discuss later, this
7 most likely reflects the highly polluted nature of air masses and aerosols in these regions.

8 Aerosol samples from the Indian Ocean/Asian regions (Fig. 4), the Atlantic Ocean
9 (Figs. 5 and 6), the Pacific Ocean (Fig. 7), the Gulf of Aqaba (Fig. 8) and the Southern
10 Hemisphere oceans (Fig. 9) are all characterized by an hyperbolic relationship between
11 %Fe_S and Fe_T. A common feature of the Indian Ocean/Asian sampling sites, as well as
12 the sampling sites in the continental United States (site 14) and Sargasso Sea (site 21), is
13 that they receive both soil dust and anthropogenic pollution aerosols from strong local or
14 regional sources. As such, aerosols from the Indian Ocean/Asian sites define a highly
15 uniform and compact trend for %Fe_S vs. Fe_T, for which most samples with Fe_T greater
16 than ~1000 ng Fe m⁻³ have %Fe_S values between 0.1% and 2%. As noted by Kumar et
17 al. (2010) and Kumar and Sarin (2010), the moderate to high %Fe_S values (~20–50%) for
18 aerosols over the Bay of Bengal and at Mt. Abu in western India appear to be associated
19 with polluted air carried from Southeast Asia. Likewise, the aerosols with high %Fe_S
20 values collected from Taiwan, the East China Sea and Korea are associated with aerosols
21 that contain elevated concentrations of elemental carbon (Chuang et al., 2005) or heavy
22 metals (Hsu et al., 2005, 2009), indicative of anthropogenic pollution emissions. These
23 data trends are similar to those described by Sedwick et al. (2007) and Sholkovitz et al.

1 (2009) for aerosols over the Sargasso Sea, where high %Fe_S values were typically
2 associated with elevated V/Al and Ni/Al mass ratios (Fig. 10C), which are tracers of fuel
3 combustion emissions. The North Atlantic aerosol data of Buck et al. (2010a) also
4 indicate that high %Fe_S values are often associated with V-rich aerosols.

5 The majority of aerosol samples from thirteen sites in the North Atlantic Ocean
6 were collected between 10°N and 40°N. Here total aerosol iron loadings range from
7 minimum values of ~20 ng Fe m⁻³ up to maximum values of 5,000-17,000 ng Fe m⁻³.
8 The latter Fe_T values were associated with desert dust-laden air off the northwest coast of
9 Africa. The corresponding fractional solubility of aerosol iron ranges from near zero to
10 ~50%, with most values falling below 25%. Data from and Zhu et al. (1997) and Chen
11 and Siefert (2004) fall above the main data trend (Fig. 5B), although we note that the
12 latter study uses an unusually acidic leach solution (pH 1) to define soluble aerosol iron
13 (see Section 3).

14 Pacific Ocean aerosols are characterized by a greater scatter in the %Fe_S vs. Fe_T
15 relationship than aerosols sampled in the Indo/Asian region and the Atlantic Ocean.
16 Most of the Pacific samples were collected from remote open-ocean locations, thus the
17 majority of the data lie at the low end of the Fe_T range (<200 ng Fe m⁻³). The greater
18 variability in the %Fe_S vs. Fe_T trend for the Pacific Ocean aerosols may reflect the
19 relatively large geographic area that was sampled over a period of one month by Buck et
20 al. (2006); the samples collected during these long zonal and meridional transects (site 11
21 in Fig. 1) likely contain mixtures of a variety of different aerosols that include mineral
22 dust and anthropogenic aerosols from Asia and elsewhere (e.g., Duce et al., 1976, 1983;
23 Arimoto et al., 1985; Newell and Evans, 2000). This diversity of aerosol sources could

1 be expected to produce a relatively large range in %Fe_S values for the bulk aerosol at low
2 total iron loadings. Nevertheless, the data trend for the Pacific Ocean aerosols is broadly
3 consistent with those from other regions of the globe, in showing that the fractional
4 solubility of aerosol iron increases from low values (<5%) to ~10-30% as the total
5 aerosol iron loading decreases. Indeed, the %Fe_S vs. Fe_T data trend for the Pacific Ocean
6 broadly follows that defined by data from the Sargasso Sea aerosols (Fig. 7).

7 Another useful comparison is provided by the large range of %Fe_S values for
8 aerosols collected over the continental United States (Fig. 3; site 14 in Fig. 1; Siefert et
9 al., 1996). Here the aerosol samples with highest %Fe_S (40-78%) and lowest Fe_T values
10 were collected in Pasadena, California and Whiteface Mountain, New York. The latter
11 site is downwind of the highly industrialized U.S. Midwest, whereas the former, located
12 in the Los Angeles basin, is impacted by both pollution emissions and desert dust.
13 Notably, for the Los Angeles samples, total aerosol iron loading increases by ~10-fold
14 and %Fe_S drops from 11-22% to 1-4% when strong Santa Ana winds transport mineral
15 dust from the deserts of California to Pasadena, suggesting that %Fe_S reflects the relative
16 proportions of desert soils and anthropogenic emissions in the bulk aerosol.

17 The previously published data of Baker et al. (2006a,b) and Sedwick et al. (2007),
18 together with unpublished data from the authors of this paper, are presented in Figure 6.
19 The previously unpublished results add 384 data points to the compilation in Table S1.
20 These new data define a clear hyperbolic relationship between %Fe_S and Fe_T for aerosols
21 collected over the Atlantic Ocean. There is a pronounced increase in the fractional
22 solubility of aerosol iron when Fe_T values are less than ~100 ng Fe m⁻³, whereas most
23 samples with Fe_T > 400 ng Fe m⁻³ have %Fe_S values between 0.1% and 2%. The aerosols

1 collected on the Bermuda Tudor Hill tower have %Fe_S values that consistently fall below
2 those of the ship-collected aerosols (~ 0.5% vs. 1-2%), which may reflect differences in
3 the aerosol collection and processing procedures, or inherent differences in the aerosols,
4 which were sampled over a relatively large area of the subtropical and tropical North
5 Atlantic (Fig. 1).

6 The Gulf of Aqaba data of Chen et al. (2006) indicate that batch-wise leaching of
7 aerosols with pH 5.6 deionized water yields %Fe_S values that are, on average, 9-fold
8 higher than values obtained when pH 8.16 seawater is used as a leaching solution (Fig.
9 8). Nevertheless, the data from both leaching protocols define clear hyperbolic
10 relationships between %Fe_S and Fe_T. In the absence of evidence that differences in the
11 ionic strength of the leach solution (seawater vs. deionized water) lead to large
12 differences in the extent of dissolution of aerosol iron, the results of Chen et al. (2006)
13 most likely reflect an enhanced solubility of iron-containing minerals and iron oxides at
14 mildly acidic pH values (Stumm and Morgan, 1996; Desboeufs et al., 1999; Liu and
15 Millero, 2002). Early studies show that pH is a key parameter for the iron solubility of
16 marine aerosols (Zhuang et al., 1990, 1992). This interpretation is consistent with the
17 results of Witt et al. (2010), who report %Fe_S values that are 2-5 times higher for marine
18 aerosol samples that were leached batch-wise using pH 1 vs. pH 4.5 leach solutions, as
19 well the results of experimental work involving batch leaching of Saharan soils and urban
20 aerosols (Spokes et al., 1994, Spokes and Jickells, 1996). In this regard, empirical
21 estimates of %Fe_S appear to be more sensitive to leach solution pH when batch leaching
22 methods are used. Indeed, Buck et al. (2006, 2010a) and Aguilar-Islas et al. (2010) report
23 much smaller differences in %Fe_S estimates obtained using deionized water vs. seawater

1 as leach solutions, when employing flow-through and semi-continuous leaching methods,
2 respectively. In fact, Aguilar-Islas et al. (2010) estimate slightly higher %Fe_S values
3 when seawater was used as the leaching solution, which they attribute to the presence of
4 natural iron-binding organic ligands in the seawater.

5 The Southern Hemisphere samples, 57 of which provide unpublished data for the
6 South Atlantic Ocean (Fig. 2), are characterized by extremely low aerosol iron loadings
7 (5-150 ng Fe m⁻³ air), and the familiar hyperbolic relationship between %Fe_S and Fe_T
8 (Fig. 9). With the exception of one high value (48%), %Fe_S estimates range from 0.5%
9 to 22%. Around a quarter of the Southern Hemisphere samples have %Fe_S values less
10 than 2%, which is similar to %Fe_S estimates for aerosols in other regions of the globe that
11 are impacted by soil dust (Figs. 3-8). Some forty percent of the samples have %Fe_S
12 values >5% , while fourteen percent have %Fe_S values >10%. A large proportion of the
13 samples with high %Fe_S (>5%) and low Fe_T values were collected on cruises Z-D and
14 BGH, which covered the most remote areas of the South Atlantic Ocean (Fig. 2). By way
15 of comparison, the more elevated %Fe_S values for the Sargasso Sea aerosol samples
16 correspond to Fe_T values < 60 ng Fe m⁻³ air, which are thought to be associated with an
17 increased proportion of anthropogenic combustion aerosols carried from North America
18 and Europe (Sedwick et al., 2007).

19 It is difficult to explain the elevated %Fe_S values in our data compilation based on
20 the solubility of iron in aerosols derived from natural sources. The fractional solubility of
21 iron in arid continental soils (< 0.1-0.5% and in some cases < 0.01%) are less than the
22 values of 0.5-2% that are typically associated with marine aerosols carried from Africa
23 and Asia (Fig. 3 and Table S2; Desboeufs et al., 1999; Journet et al., 2008; Schroth et al.,

1 2009; Paris et al., 2010, 2011; Srinivas et al., 2011). This difference may reflect
2 chemical and mineralogical variations in the dust source materials, as well as chemical
3 and/or physical processing of soil dust after emission to the atmosphere (Journet et al.,
4 2008; Paris et al., 2010). Furthermore, estimates of the fractional solubility of iron in
5 aerosols produced from natural biomass burning are not particularly high: Guieu et al.
6 (2005) and Paris et al. (2010) report %Fe_S values of ~2% for samples collected off Africa
7 and southern France.

8

9 **4.2. Modeling results**

10 The pervasive curvilinear trend in %Fe_S vs. Fe_T that is described in the preceding
11 section resembles the mixing hyperbola that is produced by the conservative mixing of
12 two geochemical end members (e.g., see Faure and Mensing, 2005). To examine whether
13 this simple conceptual model can adequately describe the %Fe_S vs. Fe_T trend that is
14 defined by the global-scale data set shown in Fig. 3, we have modeled the trend that
15 would result from the conservative mixing of two aerosol end-member populations, A
16 and B, each characterized by distinct atmospheric concentrations of soluble aerosol iron
17 (Fe'_A and Fe'_B, respectively) and total aerosol iron (Fe_A and Fe_B, respectively). This
18 yields the following expressions for the soluble aerosol iron loading (Fe'_M) and total
19 aerosol iron loading (Fe_M) of resulting aerosol mixtures (Faure and Mensing, 2005):

$$20 \text{ Fe}'_M = \text{Fe}'_A f_A + \text{Fe}'_B (1 - f_A) \quad (1)$$

$$21 \text{ Fe}_M = \text{Fe}_A f_A + \text{Fe}_B (1 - f_A) \quad (2)$$

1 where f_A and f_B are the fractions of aerosols A and B, respectively, in the aerosol mixture.
2 The percent fractional solubility for the aerosol iron in the mixture (bulk aerosol) is then
3 given by:

$$4 \quad \%Fe_S = 100(Fe'_M/Fe_M) = 100[Fe'_A f_A + Fe'_B(1 - f_A)]/[Fe_A f_A + Fe_B(1 - f_A)] \quad (3)$$

5 Using Eq. (3), we have calculated $\%Fe_S$ as a function of Fe_T for various
6 combinations of plausible end-member aerosol iron loadings (Fe_A and Fe_B) and
7 corresponding end-member fractional solubility of aerosol iron ($100Fe'_A/Fe_A$ and $100Fe'_B$
8 $/Fe_B$, respectively). In this conceptual model, we follow the approach used by Sedwick et
9 al., (2007). One of the aerosol members is characterized by relatively high aerosol iron
10 loading (Fe_T) and relatively low fractional solubility of aerosol iron ($\%Fe_S$), as is typical
11 of aerosols derived from arid continental soils (e.g., Saharan dust); we refer to this as the
12 'lithogenic' aerosol end-member. The other end-member is characterized by relatively
13 low aerosol iron loading (Fe_T) and relatively high fractional solubility of aerosol iron
14 ($\%Fe_S$). As discussed in Section 5, the elevated fractional solubility of iron in this end-
15 member may reflect an inherently higher solubility of iron in aerosols derived from
16 anthropogenic and natural combustion sources, and/or the chemical alteration of
17 lithogenic dust by pollutants (largely combustion related) during atmospheric transport.
18 We thus refer to this as the 'combustion' aerosol end-member. Fig. 10A shows the
19 resulting trends for the mixtures using eight combinations of plausible aerosol end
20 members, based on the observed $\%Fe_S$ and Fe_T values of the global data set shown in
21 Figs. 3-9. Details of the mixing model and the results for the eight case studies are found
22 in Table S3 of the Supplementary material (see <http://dx.doi.org/10.1575/1912/5104>).

1 As expected, the shape of the modeled mixing trend changes according to the
2 values of %Fe_S and Fe_T assigned to the aerosol end-members. The eight different cases
3 indicate that the model results are most sensitive to the Fe_T values selected for the
4 combustion aerosol end-member (Fig. 10A). Case III, which uses aerosol end-members
5 with total iron loadings of 10 ng m⁻³ and 2000 ng m⁻³, and corresponding %Fe_S values of
6 50% and 1%, respectively, appears to adequately describe the trend for a major fraction
7 of the global data set (black circles in Fig. 3B). In contrast, the case V end-members
8 appear to better describe the trend defined by aerosol samples from the East China Sea,
9 South Korea, the Gulf of Aqaba and the continental USA, all of which are distinguished
10 by elevated %Fe_S values for total aerosol iron loadings in the range of 50-1000 ng m⁻³
11 (Figs. 3 and 4). The case V example uses aerosol end-members with total iron loadings
12 of 100 and 2000 ng m⁻³, and corresponding %Fe_S values of 50% and 1%, respectively.
13 Hence, case V differs from case III in having a 10-fold higher aerosol iron loading for the
14 combustion aerosol end-member, as might be expected nearer the likely source of such
15 aerosols in Asia, Eurasia and North America. In broad terms, the %Fe_S vs. Fe_T trends
16 defined by the global aerosol data set (Fig. 3B) are reasonably well described and
17 constrained by the eight aerosol mixtures that we have considered, in that most of the
18 global data fall between the mixing lines defined by the examples of cases III and V.

19 It should be noted that the hyperbolic relationship that we observe is not an
20 artefact of plotting %Fe_S vs. Fe_T, which is essentially equivalent to plotting Fe_S/Fe_T vs.
21 Fe_T. The only constraints on the two variables, Fe_S and Fe_T, are that Fe_T ≥ 0 and that 0 ≤
22 Fe_S ≤ Fe_T. If a set of random Fe_S and Fe_T values are selected with these constraints, then

1 Fe_S/Fe_T vs. Fe_T produces a random scatter plot, and not the well-defined curvilinear trend
2 that is apparent in Fig. 3.

3

4 **5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

5

6 **5.1. Sources of iron to the atmosphere**

7 Aerosol iron in Earth's lower atmosphere has both natural and anthropogenic
8 sources. Soils in arid continental regions are the major sources of natural aerosol iron, in
9 the form of clay minerals and iron oxides, which we term 'lithogenic aerosols' (Jickells
10 and Spokes, 2001; Jickells et al., 2005; Luo et al., 2008; Mahowald et al., 2009; Baker
11 and Croot, 2010; Raiswell and Canfield, 2012). Iron-bearing aerosols are also derived or
12 impacted by emissions from various combustion processes, both anthropogenic and
13 natural. As detailed by Luo et al. (2008), these include fossil fuel combustion (coal and
14 oil used for electricity, industry, transport, heating), a variety of industrial processes,
15 human combustion of wood, agricultural wastes and biofuels and natural biomass
16 burning. In this paper we use the term 'combustion aerosols' to cover these forms of
17 aerosols. As noted in Section 5.5, lithogenic aerosols that have been chemically altered
18 by acidic species can have elevated fractional solubility of iron with respect to arid soil
19 samples. Acidic species (SO_2 in particular), are largely derived from anthropogenic
20 combustion processes (Hand et al., 2004; Meskhidze et al., 2005).

21

22 **5.2. Aerosol iron solubility data derived from leaching procedures**

23 Raiswell and Canfield (2012) note that iron-bearing aerosols undergo a complex

1 series of chemical reactions and transformations in the atmosphere before reaching the
2 ocean. These authors suggest that a common agreed aerosol leaching protocol would be
3 an important step toward an improved understanding of aerosol iron dissolution, as would
4 an increased focus on aerosol mineralogy and the role of colloids and nanoparticles in the
5 interpretation of aerosol dissolution experiments. While the latter recommendation is
6 clearly beyond the scope of this paper, we heartily concur with the suggestion that a
7 standard aerosol leaching protocol be adopted by aerosol iron researchers. In this regard,
8 it is important to recognize that the various leaching protocols that were used to derive
9 the data compiled in this paper can only provide operational definitions of the fractional
10 solubility of aerosol iron. That is, such leaching methods are unable to faithfully mimic
11 the dissolution of aerosol iron in meteoric waters, nor the release of dissolved iron from
12 aerosols into surface ocean waters (Sedwick et al., 2007; Aguilar Islas et al., 2010; Baker
13 and Croot, 2010). Aerosol dissolution experiments thus provide qualitative and semi-
14 quantitative information on the 'effective' solubility of iron that is delivered to the ocean
15 via dry and wet deposition.

16 A robust evaluation and intercomparison of aerosol leaching protocols is also
17 beyond the scope of this paper. Indeed, a comprehensive assessment of the impact of
18 leaching protocols on resulting estimates of 'soluble' aerosol iron requires the application
19 of different leaching methods to sets of identical aerosol samples, as has been attempted
20 in the studies of Chen et al. (2006) and Aguilar-Islas et al. (2010). The data presented in
21 Figures 3-9 do allow the comparison of %Fe_s values derived using different leaching
22 protocols (as identified by the figure legends), although such comparisons are necessarily
23 tenuous, given that the data for different leaching methods were derived from samples at

1 diverse locations and dates. Fig. 13 in Sholkovitz et al. (2009) is an example of good
2 agreement between two different storage and leaching protocols, one using frozen storage
3 and one using immediate leaching. The most significant observation with respect to the
4 intercomparison issue is the pronounced and consistent trend in %Fe_S vs. Fe_T that is
5 observed for the global-scale data set (Fig. 3), this *despite* the wide variety of techniques
6 that were used to collect, store and leach the aerosol samples. As noted by Aguilar-Islas
7 et al. (2010), this result implies that inherent differences in the composition and source of
8 aerosol samples are more important in determining the effective solubility of aerosol iron
9 than differences between leaching protocols.

10

11 **5.3. Fractional solubility of aerosol iron over the ocean**

12 Our global-scale aerosol data compilation reveals a large range in the fractional
13 solubility of aerosol iron (~0-95%), as well as a consistent hyperbolic trend in the
14 fractional solubility of aerosol iron as a function of total aerosol iron loading (Figs. 3-9).
15 The hyperbolic relationship in %Fe_S vs. Fe_T for the global data set essentially follows that
16 identified for aerosols collected in the Sargasso Sea by Sedwick et al. (2007), who
17 showed that such a trend could be explained by the conservative mixing between two
18 aerosol end-members with (1) high Fe_T and relatively low %Fe_S (~1%) and (2) low Fe_T
19 and relatively high %Fe_S (~20% or more), as shown in Figure 10B. Kumar and Sarin
20 (2009) and Kumar et al. (2010) have also shown that a simple two end-member aerosol
21 mixing model can describe the hyperbolic trend in %Fe_S vs. Fe_T observed for aerosols
22 collected from Mt. Abu in northwest India and over the northern Indian Ocean. The
23 model results that are presented in Figure 10A confirm that this simple mixing model, as

1 detailed in Section 4.2, can also adequately describe the %Fe_S vs. Fe_T trend defined by
2 the global-scale data compilation.

3 Clearly, our two end-member conservative mixing model simplifies the process
4 by which aerosols with different characteristics are mixed in the marine boundary layer.
5 In reality, the bulk marine aerosol will reflect the mixing of multiple aerosol types, both
6 natural and anthropogenic, which are each characterized by different atmospheric
7 loadings and %Fe_S values, depending on their sources and transport histories. A greater
8 variability in %Fe_S might be expected for lower Fe_T values, reflecting both spatial and
9 temporal differences in the composition, alteration and loading of the putative
10 'combustion' aerosols. This expectation is consistent with the greater spread of the global
11 %Fe_S data at lower Fe_T values (Fig. 3). Indeed, the range in %Fe_S for combustion-
12 derived aerosols is expected to be large. Iron in oil fly ash can reach fractional solubility
13 values of 80%, based on leaching with in pH 5.5 deionized water (Schroth et al., 2009),
14 and Desboeufs et al. (2005) have reported %Fe_S values of 0.2, 3.0 and 36% for coal fly
15 ash, urban dust and oil fly ash, respectively.

16 In summary, our global data compilation is broadly consistent with the simple
17 conceptual model whereby the fractional solubility of iron in the bulk marine aerosol is
18 dominated by the inherently low %Fe_S values (~1%) of lithogenic aerosols (soil dust) for
19 total aerosol iron loadings greater than ~500-1000 ng Fe m⁻³. For Fe_T values below ~500
20 ng Fe m⁻³, it appears that marine aerosols contain iron that is inherently more soluble than
21 that carried in soil dust, resulting in high average %Fe_S values for the bulk aerosols in
22 'non-dusty' marine air.

23

1 **5.4. Wet deposition of soluble iron**

2 Although this paper focuses on the fractional solubility of iron in dry aerosols,
3 and thus implicitly on the process of dry deposition, wet deposition is thought to account
4 for a significant fraction of the input of soluble aerosol iron to the ocean (Ginoux et al.,
5 2001; Kim and Church, 2001; Özsoy and Saydam, 2001; Gao et al., 2003; Luo et al.,
6 2003; Fan et al., 2006; Breitbarth et al., 2010; Raiswell and Canfield, 2012). Indeed,
7 much of the iron delivered in wet deposition may enter the ocean in dissolved form
8 (where 'dissolved' is defined by filtration). However, the magnitude of wet-deposition
9 fluxes remains poorly constrained, owing to the small number of studies with appropriate
10 field data, which largely reflects the patchy and episodic nature of rainfall over the open
11 ocean (Jickells and Spokes, 2001; Jickells et al., 2005; Mahowald et al., 2005; Sedwick et
12 al., 2005).

13 In addition to the aerosol samples discussed in this paper, Sedwick et al. (2007)
14 have also reported data on the operational solubility of iron for nine rainwater samples
15 collected in the Sargasso Sea cruises during 2003 and 2004. Here the operational
16 solubility of iron in rainwater ($\%Fe_{S-rain}$) is defined as $dFe_{rain}/TDFe_{rain} \times 100$, where
17 dFe_{rain} is the concentration of 'dissolved iron' measured in rainwater that was
18 immediately filtered through a 0.4 μm pore polycarbonate membrane, and $TDFe_{rain}$ is the
19 concentration of 'total-dissolvable iron' in the unfiltered rainwater sample after it was
20 acidified to $\sim pH$ 1.6 with hydrochloric acid and stored for >6 months. The thus
21 determined $\%Fe_{S-rain}$ values range from $\sim 0.6\%$ to $\sim 12\%$, which lie within the range of
22 fractional iron solubility values ($\%FeS$) obtained for aerosols collected during the same
23 cruises (see Fig. 10B). In most cases, $\%Fe_{S-rain}$ values are remarkably similar to

1 corresponding %Fe_S values obtained for aerosols using a pH 5.5 deionized water leach.
2 Moreover, the rainwater iron data reveal a trend that resembles the aerosol iron solubility
3 data (Fig. 10B), in that the highest values of %Fe_{S-rain} tend to be associated with low
4 TDFe_{rain} concentrations. These data are not inconsistent with the idea that the
5 composition of aerosols is the primary determinant for the effective solubility of aerosol
6 iron in both dry and wet deposition to the Sargasso Sea.

7 Studies of rainwater and aerosols collected in the eastern Mediterranean Sea lead
8 to a similar conclusion. Samples collected by Theodosi et al. (2010a) indicate fractional
9 solubility values of ~0.5% for iron in rainwater (pH ~ 8) collected during Saharan dust
10 episodes. In contrast, their acidic (pH 4-5) polluted rainwater samples yield iron
11 solubility values of 27%. Theodosi et al. (2010b) note that the operational solubility of
12 iron in wet and dry deposition in the eastern Mediterranean Sea increases significantly
13 with decreasing dust loading and decreasing pH. Séguret et al. (2011)'s study of dry
14 deposition to this same region uses seawater leaching experiments to show that the
15 maximum fractional solubility of iron in Saharan dust is ~ 1%; whereas values as high as
16 12% were obtained for aerosols associated with anthropogenic emissions. In summary,
17 there are limited data which suggest that the effective solubility of iron in wet deposition
18 may depend on the total iron concentration in a manner similar to that identified for dry
19 aerosols, although there is a clear need for more field studies that focus on the effective
20 solubility of iron in wet deposition.

21

22 **5.5. Aerosol iron solubility: role of atmospheric processing vs. source**

1 In this section we consider the elevated fractional solubility of aerosol iron when
2 total aerosol iron loadings are low, which is a key observation that emerges from our
3 global data compilation. As was briefly mentioned in Section 4.1, possible explanations
4 include the chemical and/or physical processing of soil dust during long-range
5 atmospheric transport, as well as source-dependent chemical and mineralogical variations
6 in the iron-bearing aerosols. Size sorting of aerosol particles in the atmosphere, leading
7 to an increase in the surface area to volume ratio for smaller particles (Baker and Jickells,
8 2006), has not found support in recent field studies of aerosol iron solubility (e.g., Buck
9 et al., 2006, 2010b; Shi et al., 2011). However, aerosol iron solubility may vary as a
10 function of source-dependent differences in aerosol particle size, such that elevated %Fe_s
11 values are associated with small, combustion-derived aerosols (Srinivas et al., 2011).

12 It has long been argued that aerosol iron solubility increases during long-range
13 transport due to the ‘atmospheric chemical processing’. This process is generally thought
14 to include the reduction of Fe(III) to Fe(II), mediated by the presence of acidic inorganic
15 and organic species (particularly anthropogenic SO₂, NO_x, and their oxidation products)
16 and/or sunlight, during cycles of condensation and evaporation of meteoric water (Baker
17 and Croot, 2010; Breitbarth et al., 2010; Bligh and Waite; 2011; Raiswell and Canfield,
18 2012).

19 Although there is little doubt that atmospheric chemical processing serves to
20 increase the fractional solubility of iron in lithogenic aerosols, there is no clear consensus
21 on the importance of this process. Data from a number of field studies reveal no
22 consistent relationship between the operational solubility of aerosol iron and the
23 concentrations of non-sea-salt sulfate (nss-sulfate), oxalate, nitrate, acidity, or distance

1 from source (Chen and Siefert, 2004; Baker et al., 2006a,b; Buck et al., 2006, Paris et al.,
2 2010). In contrast, Kumar et al. (2010) and Srinivas et al. (2011) suggest that acid
3 dissolution significantly increases the %Fe_S of aerosols collected over the Bay of Bengal,
4 based on significant correlations between %Fe_S and nss-sulfate. We note, however, that
5 correlation between these two parameters does not necessarily imply a mechanistic
6 relationship: it is possible that aerosols with high nss-sulfate concentrations are
7 associated with the same emission processes that produce combustion aerosols for which
8 the fractional solubility of iron is inherently elevated relative to lithogenic dust. Indeed,
9 the use of field measurements to identify changes in aerosol iron solubility during
10 atmospheric transport is inherently difficult.

11 Much of the evidence for the impact of atmospheric chemical processing on
12 aerosol iron solubility comes from numerical modeling and laboratory-based studies.
13 The modeling study of Hand et al. (2004) simulates the atmospheric transport, chemical
14 reaction and deposition of iron-bearing aerosols. In this model, fine and coarse sized
15 aerosols from the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans have an initial %Fe_S value of ~ 0.1%. The
16 combination of solar radiation and cloud processing increases %Fe_S to values of 4-10%.
17 Meskhidze et al. (2005) model the chemical reactions of lithogenic aerosols with
18 anthropogenic acidic species and conclude that this atmospheric processing yields a
19 relatively small increase (from 0.1% to 0.5%) increase in aerosol iron solubility during
20 transport across the North Pacific Ocean. Using a model that includes the reactions
21 lithogenic dust with HNO₃ and SO₂, Fan et al. (2006) estimate values of 4.6% and 17%
22 for the global average solubility of iron in dry and wet deposition, respectively, with
23 values exhibiting a large geographic variability. Results of a leaching experiment by

1 Paris et al. (2011) show that oxalic acid at pH 4.7 increases the solubility of aerosol iron
2 in African dust from 0.003% to 0.25 %, whereas the modeling study of Luo and Gao
3 (2010) suggests that oxalic acid increases the solubility of iron in lithogenic dust to
4 values of 1-3%. Other model results reported by Luo and Gao (2010) similarly suggest
5 that atmospheric chemical processing results in relatively modest increases in aerosol
6 iron solubility, with most %Fe_S values falling between 0.5% and 5%.

7 Taken together, the results of the abovementioned studies provide compelling
8 evidence that atmospheric chemical processing can increase the fractional solubility of
9 iron in lithogenic aerosols. However, the proposed increases in %Fe_S via this process are
10 not large, with maximum values in the range of 1-5% for most cases. In contrast, our
11 global-scale compilation of empirical estimates of aerosol iron solubility shows a
12 substantial portion of samples have %Fe_S values >10%. On this basis, we assert that
13 source-dependent variations in aerosol composition - specifically, the emission of
14 aerosols from anthropogenic and natural combustion processes – must be a major
15 determinant of aerosol iron solubility (see Sedwick et al., 2007; Sholkovitz et al., 2009).
16 In summary, we conclude that both atmospheric chemical processing and the emission of
17 aerosols from combustion processes contribute to the elevated %Fe_S values observed at
18 low aerosol iron loadings. Although the relative importance of these processes may vary
19 on a regional basis, the latter appears to be most important at the global scale.

20

21 **5.6. Mineral dust and the human perturbation of the iron cycle**

22 The long-range atmospheric transport and deposition of natural and anthropogenic
23 aerosols over the ocean is well documented (e.g., Duce et al., 1976, 1983; Rahn, 1981;

1 Rahn and Lowenthal, 1984; Arimoto et al., 1995; Prospero, 1999; Newell and Evans,
2 2000; Gangoiti et al., 2006; Hadley et al., 2007; Ito, 2011; Siddaway and Petelina, 2011).
3 In the context of the atmospheric input of biologically available iron to the surface ocean,
4 the fractional solubility of aerosol iron is a critical parameter (e.g., Jickells et al., 2005;
5 Mahowald et al., 2005, 2009). Most global-scale biogeochemical models have assigned
6 fixed solubility values to aerosol iron, with %Fe_S typically in the range of 1-2% (Archer
7 and Johnson, 2000; Aumont et al., 2003; Gregg et al., 2003; Moore et al., 2004; Parekh et
8 al., 2004; Chase et al., 2006; Moore and Doney, 2007) or 1-10% (Lefèvre and Watson,
9 1999; Fung et al., 2000; Gao et al., 2003). As an alternative approach to this problem,
10 our global-scale data compilation suggests that the fractional solubility of aerosol iron
11 might be scaled to vary as a function of total aerosol iron loading, following the empirical
12 trend defined by the data in Figure 3. However, we note that the significant range in
13 %Fe_S values for any given Fe_T will have a large impact on the range of model-based
14 estimates of soluble iron deposition. The global compilation shows that %Fe_S varies over
15 roughly a factor of four, from ~0.5% and ~2%, at mid-to-high (dusty) range of Fe_T values
16 (Fig. 3). Hence, it hard to more accurately predict the fractional solubility of Fe for
17 lithogenic dust from the arid regions of the world that provide a major source of ‘new’
18 soluble iron to the ocean.

19 In terms of understanding the atmospheric input of biologically-available iron to
20 the ocean, a significant conclusion that emerges from our data compilation is that
21 combustion aerosols appear to constitute a significant source of highly soluble iron to the
22 surface ocean. This implies that the aeolian flux of dissolved iron to the surface ocean
23 does not necessarily scale with total aerosol iron deposition, because the soluble fraction

1 of the total iron deposition can vary greatly according to the composition of the bulk
2 aerosol. Despite low total aerosol iron loadings, regions receiving combustion aerosols
3 with relatively high %Fe_S values may receive a disproportionately large aeolian flux of
4 soluble Fe. Indeed, modeled flux estimates by Sholkovitz et al. (2009) suggest that
5 combustion aerosols may contribute as much as 70% and 85% of the annual soluble iron
6 input to the surface ocean near Bermuda and Ireland, respectively, implying that human
7 activities have profoundly affected the iron budget for the North Atlantic Ocean.
8 Continued anthropogenic emissions of iron-bearing combustion aerosols thus have the
9 potential to influence the magnitude and spatial distribution of soluble iron input to the
10 surface ocean, with attendant impacts on marine biota and carbon cycling (Moore et al.,
11 2004; Moore and Doney, 2007; Krishnamurthy et al., 2009; Mahowald et al., 2009, 2011;
12 Okin et al. 2011). As noted in the Introduction, the global-scale models of Luo et al.
13 (2008) and Mahowald et al. (2009) suggest that combustion aerosols are currently an
14 important , if not the dominant, source of soluble iron to the surface ocean. In these
15 model studies, %Fe_S values of 0.45% and 4% are assigned for lithogenic and combustion
16 aerosols, respectively. Our compilation of empirical %Fe_S data indicates that 4% is a
17 conservative minimum value for combustion aerosols, hence these models may
18 underestimate the importance of combustion aerosols to the ocean iron budget.
19

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by U.S. National Science Foundation Grants OCE-0222053 and OCE-0138352 (P.N.S), OCE-0350229 (E.R.S) and OCE-0222046 (T.M.C); ERS also received support from WHOI as part of their program to foster research by Emeritus Scientists. A.R.B and C.F.P received support from the U.K. Natural Environment Research Council Grants NE/E010180/1 and NE/C00193/1. The WHOI ICP-MS facility was used for analyses of *FeAST* and *FeATMISS* samples. Jack Cook of the WHOI Graphics Department is thanked for his work on the figures. We thank Shieh-Chieh Hsu, Anne Johansen and M. Sarin for providing the iron solubility data that appear in a graphical form in their papers. Special thanks goes to Ann Devenish, the *WHOAS* project manager at WHOI, for help on the Supplementary link. Reviews by R. Raiswell and two anonymous referees stimulated the improvement of this paper.

REFERENCES

- 1
- 2 Archer D., and Johnson K. (2000) A model of the iron cycle in the ocean. *Global*
3 *Biogeochem. Cycles* **14**, 269-279.
- 4 Aguilar-Islas A. M., Wu J., and Rember R. (2010) Dissolution of aerosol-derived iron in
5 seawater: leach solution chemistry, aerosol type, and colloidal iron fraction. *Mar. Chem.*
6 **120**, 25-33, doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2009.01.011.
- 7 Arimoto R., Duce R. A., Ray B. J., and Unni C. K. (1985) Atmospheric trace elements at
8 Enewetak Atoll: 2. Transport to the ocean by wet and dry deposition. *J. Geophys. Res.*
9 **90**, D1, 2391-2408.
- 10 Arimoto R., Duce R. A., Ray B. J., Ellis Jr. W. G., Cullen J. D., and Merrill J. T. (1995)
11 Trace elements in the atmosphere over the North Atlantic. *J. Geophys. Res.* **100**, 1199-
12 1213.
- 13 Aumont O., Maier-Reimer E., Blain S., and Monfray P. (2003) An ecosystem model of the
14 global ocean including Fe, Si, P colimitations. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **17**, 1060,
15 doi:10.1029/2001GB001745.
- 16 Baker A. R., and Jickells T. D. (2006) Mineral particle size as a control on aerosol iron
17 solubility. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33**, L17608, doi:10.1029/2006GL026557.
- 18 Baker A. R., and Croot P. L. (2010) Atmospheric and marine controls on aerosol iron
19 solubility in seawater, *Mar. Chem.* **120**, 4-13. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2008.09.003.
- 20 Baker A. R., Jickells T., Witt M., and Linge K. L. (2006a) Trends in the solubility of iron,
21 aluminium, manganese and phosphorus in aerosol collected over the Atlantic Ocean.
22 *Mar. Chem.* **98**, 43-58.

1 Baker A. R., French M., and Linge K. L. (2006b) Trends in aerosol nutrient solubility along
2 a west-east transect of the Saharan dust plume. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33**, L07805,
3 doi:10.1029/2005GL024764.

4 Bligh M. W., and Waite T. D. (2011) Formation, reactivity, and aging of ferric oxide
5 particles formed from Fe (II) and Fe (III) sources: Implications for iron bioavailability in
6 the marine environment. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta.* **75**, 7741-7758.

7 Bonnet S., and Guieu C. (2004). Dissolution of atmospheric iron in seawater. *Geophys. Res.*
8 *Lett.* **L03303**, 10.1029/2003GL018423.

9 Bowie A. R., Lannuzel D., Remenyi T. A., Wagener T. , Lam P. J., Boyd, P. W., Guieu C.,
10 Townsend A. T., and Trull T. W. (2011) Biogeochemical iron budget of the Southern
11 Ocean south of Australia: decoupling of iron and nutrient cycles in the sub-antarctic zone
12 by the summertime supply. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **23**, GB4034,
13 doi:10.1029/2009GB003500.

14 Breitbarth E., Achterberg E. P., Ardelan M. V., Baker A. R., Bucciarelli E., Chever F., Croot
15 P. L., Duggen S., Gledhill M., Hassellöv M., Hassler C., Hoffmann L. J., Hunter K. A.,
16 Hutchins D. A., Ingri J., Jickells T., Lohan M. C., Neilsdottir, M. C., Sarthou G.,
17 Schoemann V., Trapp J. M., Turner D. R., and Ye Y. (2010) Iron biogeochemistry across
18 marine systems – progress from the past decade. *Biogeosci.* **7**, 1075-1097,
19 [www.biogeosciences.net/ 7/1075/2010](http://www.biogeosciences.net/7/1075/2010).

20 Breslin V.T., and Duedall I. W. (1987) Metal release from particulate oil ash in seawater.
21 *Mar. Chem.* **22**, 31-42.

1 Buck C. S., Landing W. M., Resing J. A., and Lebon G. T. (2006) Aerosol iron and
2 aluminum solubility in the northwest Pacific Ocean: Results from the 2002 IOC cruise.
3 *Geochem. Geophys. Geosyst.* **7**, Q04M07, doi:10.1029/2005GC000977.

4 Buck C.S., Landing W. M., Resing J. A., and Measures C. I. (2010a) The solubility and
5 deposition of aerosol Fe and other trace elements in the North Atlantic Ocean:
6 Observations from A16N CLIVAR/CO₂ repeat hydrography section. *Mar. Chem.* **120**,
7 doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2008.08.003.

8 Buck C. S., Landing W. M., and Resing J. A. (2010b) Particle size and aerosol iron
9 solubility: A high-resolution analysis of Atlantic aerosols. *Mar. Chem.* **120**, 14-24. doi:
10 10.1016/j.marchem.2008.11.002.

11 Chase Z., Paytan A., Johnson K. S., Street J. and Chen Y. (2006) Input and cycling of iron in
12 the Gulf of Aquaba, Red Sea. *Global Biogeochem.Cycles* **20**, GB3017,
13 doi:10.1029/2005GB002646

14 Chen Y. (2004) Sources and fate of atmospheric nutrients over the remote oceans and their
15 role on controlling marine diazotrophic microorganisms. Ph.D. Thesis, University of
16 Maryland.

17 Chen Y., and Siefert R. L. (2003) Determination of various types of labile iron over remote
18 oceans. *J. Geophys. Res.* **108**, D24, doi:10:1029/2003JD003515.

19 Chen Y., and Siefert R. L. (2004) Seasonal and spatial distributions and dry deposition
20 fluxes of atmospheric total and labile iron over the tropical and subtropical North Atlantic
21 Ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.* **109**, D09305, doi:10.1029/2003JD003958.

1 Chen Y., Street J., and Paytan, A. (2006) Comparison between pure-water- and seawater-
2 soluble nutrient concentrations of aerosols from the Gulf of Aqaba. *Mar. Chem.* **101**,
3 141-152.

4 Chester R. K., Murphy K. J. T., Lin F. J., Berry A. S., Bradshaw G. A., and Corcoran P. A.
5 (1993) Factors controlling the solubilities of trace metals from non-remote aerosols to the
6 sea surface by the 'dry' deposition mode. *Mar. Chem.* **42**, 107-126.

7 Chuang P. Y., Duvall R. M., Shafer M. M., and Schaur J. J. (2005) The origin of water
8 soluble particulate iron in the Asian atmospheric outflow. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **32**,
9 L07813, doi:10.1029/2004GL021946.

10 Crecelius E. (1980) The solubility of coal fly ash and marine aerosols in seawater. *Mar.*
11 *Chem.* **8**, 245-350.

12 Cwiertny D. M., Baltrusaitis J., Hunter G. J., Laskin A., Scherer M. M., and Grassian V. H.
13 (2008) Characterization and acid-mobilization study of iron-containing mineral dust
14 source material. *J. Geophys. Res.* **113**, D05202, doi:10.1029/2007JD009332.

15 Desboeufs K. V., Losno R., Vimeux F., and Cholbi S. (1999) The pH-dependent dissolution
16 of wind-transported Saharan dust. *J. Geophys. Res.* **104**, D17, 21,287-21,299.

17 Desboeufs K. V., Sofikitis A., Losno R., Colin J. L., and Ausset P. (2005) Dissolution and
18 solubility of trace metals from natural and anthropogenic aerosol particulate matter.
19 *Chemosphere* **58**, 195-203.

20 Duce R. A., and Tindale N.W. (1991) Atmospheric transport of iron and its deposition in the
21 ocean. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **36**, 1715-1726.

22 Duce R. A., Hoffman G. L., Ray B. J., Fletcher I. S., Walsh P. R., Fasching J. L., Piotrowicz
23 S. R., Hoffman E. J., Miller J. M., and Heffter J. L. (1976) Trace metals in the marine

1 atmosphere: Sources and fluxes, in *Marine Pollutant Transfer*, edited by H. Windom and
2 R. A Duce, pp. 77-120, D. C. Heath, Lexington, Mass.

3 Duce R. A., Arimoto R., Ray B. J., Unni C. K., and Harder P. J. (1983) Atmospheric trace
4 elements at Enewetak Atoll, 1. Concentrations, sources, and temporal variability. *J*
5 *Geophys. Res.* **88**, 5321-5342.

6 Duce R. A., Liss P. S, Merrill J. T, Atlas E. L., Buat-Menard P., Hicks B. B., Miller J. M,
7 Prospero J. M., Arimoto R., Church T. M., Ellis W., Galloway J. M., Hansen L., Jickells
8 T. D., Knap A. H., Reinhardt K. H., Schneider B., Soudine A., Toko J. J., Tsunogai S.,
9 Wollast R., and Zhou M. (1991) The atmospheric input of trace species to the world
10 ocean. *Global Biogeochem.Cycles* **5**, 193.

11 Duvall R. M., Majestic B. J., Shafer M. M., Chuang P.Y., Simoneit B. R. T., and Schauer J.
12 J. (2008) The water-soluble fraction of carbon, sulfur, and crustal elements in Asian
13 aerosols and Asian soils. *Atmos. Environ.* **42**, 5872-5884.

14 Fan S-M., Moxim W. J., and Levy H. (2006) Aeolian input of bioavailable iron to the ocean.
15 *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **33**, L07602, doi:10.1029/2005GL024852.

16 Faure G, and Mensing T. M. (2005) *Isotopes: Principles and Applications*. 3 rd Edition,
17 John Wiley and Sons, Hoboken, N. J.

18 Fung I., Meyn S. K., Tegen I., Doney S. C., John J. G., and Bishop J. K. B. (2000) Iron
19 supply and demand in the upper ocean. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **14**, 281-295.

20 Gangoiti G., Alonso L., Navazo M., Garcia J. A., and Millan M .M. (2006) North African
21 soil dust and European pollution transport to America during the warm season: hidden
22 links shown by passive tracer simulation. *J. Geophys. Res.* **111**, D10109,
23 doi:10.1029/2005JD005941.

1 Gao Y., Fan S., and Sarmiento J. L. (2003) Aeolian iron input to the ocean through
2 precipitation scavenging: A modeling perspective and its implication for natural iron
3 fertilization in the ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.* **108 (D7)**, 4221, doi:10.1029/2002JD002420.

4 Ginoux P., Chin M., Tegen I., Prospero J. M., Holben B., Dubovik O., and Lin S.-J. (2001)
5 Sources and distribution of dust aerosols simulated with the GOCART model. *J.*
6 *Geophys. Res.* **106 (D17)**, 20,255-20,273.

7 Gregg W. W., Ginoux P., Schopf P. S., and Casey N. W. (2003) Phytoplankton and iron:
8 validation of a global three-dimensional ocean biogeochemical model. *Deep-Sea Res. II*,
9 **50**, 3143-3169.

10 Guieu C., Bonnet S., and Wagener T. (2005) Biomass burning as a source of dissolved iron
11 to the open ocean. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **32**, L19608, doi:10.1029/2005GL022962.

12 Hadley O. L., Ramanathan V., Carmichael G. R., Tang Y., Corrigan C. E., Roberts G. C.,
13 and Mauger G. S. (2007), Trans-Pacific transport of black carbon and fine aerosol ($D < 2.5$
14 μm) into North America, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 112, D05309, doi:10.1029/2006JD007632.

15 Hand J. L., Mahowald N. M., Chen Y., Siefert R. L., Luo C., Subramaniam A., and Fung I.
16 (2004) Estimates of atmospheric-processed soluble iron from observations and a global
17 mineral aerosol model: Biogeochemical implications. *J. Geophys. Res.* 109, D17205,
18 doi:10.1029/2004JD004574.

19 Hardy J. T., and Crecelius E. A. (1981) Is atmospheric particulate matter inhibiting marine
20 primary productivity? *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **15**, 1103-1105.

21 Hodge V., Johnson S. R., and Goldberg E. D. (1978) Influence of atmospherically
22 transported aerosols on surface ocean water composition. *Geochem. J.* **12**, 7-20.

1 Hsu S-C., Li F-J., and Jeng W-L. (2005) Seawater solubility of natural and anthropogenic
2 metals within aerosols collected from Taiwan coastal sites. *Atmos. Environ.* **39**, 3989-
3 4001.

4 Hsu S-C., Wong G. T. F., Gong G-C., Shiah F-K., Huang Y-T., Kao S-J., Tsai F., Lung S-
5 C., Lin F-J., Lin I-I., Hung C-C., and Tseng C-M. (2009) Sources, solubility, and dry
6 deposition of aerosol trace elements over the East China Sea. *Mar. Chem.*,
7 doi:10.101016/j.marchem.2008.10.003.

8 Hsu S-C., Liu S. C., Arimoto R., Shiah F-K., Gong G-C., Huang Y-T., Kao S-J., Chen J-P.,
9 Lin F-J., Lin C-Y., Huang J-C., Tsai, F., and Lung S-C. C. (2010) Effects of acidic
10 processing, transport history, and dust and sea salt loading on iron from Asia dust. *J.*
11 *Geophys. Res.* **115**, D19313, doi:10.1029/2009JD013442.

12 Ito A. (2011) Mega-fire emissions in Siberia: potential supply of bioavailable iron from
13 forests to the ocean. *Biogeosciences* **8**, 1679-1697.

14 Jickells T. D. (1999) The inputs of dust derived elements to the Sargasso Sea. *Mar. Chem.*
15 **68**, 5-14.

16 Jickells T. D., and Spokes L. (2001) Atmospheric iron inputs to the oceans, in *The*
17 *Biogeochemistry of Iron in Seawater*, (ed., K. Hunter and D. Turner), pp. 85-122, John
18 Wiley, New York.

19 Jickells T. D., An Z .S., Andersen K. K. , Baker A. R., Bergametti G., Brooks N., Cao J. J.,
20 Boyd P. W., Duce R. A., Hunter K. A., Kawahata H., Kubilay N., LaRoche J., Liss P. S.,
21 Mahowald N., Prospero J. M., Ridgwell A. J. Tegen I., and Torres, R. (2005) Global iron
22 connections between desert dust, ocean biogeochemistry and climate. *Science* **308**, 67-71.

1 Johansen A. M., and Hoffmann M. R. (2003) Chemical characterization of ambient aerosol
2 collected during the northeast monsoon season over the Arabian Sea: Labile-Fe(II) and
3 other trace metals. *J. Geophys. Res.* **108**, D14, doi:10.1029/2002JD00380.

4 Johansen A. M., Siefert R.L., and Hoffmann M. R. (2000) Chemical composition of aerosols
5 collected over the tropical North Atlantic Ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.* **105**, D12, 15277-
6 15312.

7 Journet E., Desboeufs K. V., Caquineau S., and Colin J-L. (2008) Mineralogy as a critical
8 factor of dust iron solubility. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **35**, L07805,
9 doi:10.1029/2007GL031589.

10 Kim G., and Church T. M. (2001) Seasonal biogeochemical flux of ²³⁴Th and ²¹⁰Po in the
11 upper Sargasso Sea: Influence from atmospheric iron deposition. *Global Biogeochem.*
12 *Cycles* **15**, 651-661.

13 Krishnamurthy A. K., Moore J. K., Mahowald N., Luo C., Doney S, C., Lindsay K., and
14 Zender C. S. (2009) Impacts of increasing anthropogenic soluble iron and nitrogen
15 deposition on ocean biogeochemistry. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **23**, GB3016,
16 doi:10.1029/2008GB003440.

17 Kumar A., and Sarin M. M. (2010) Aerosol iron solubility in a semi-arid region: temporal
18 trend and impact of anthropogenic sources. *Tellus* **62B**, 125-132. doi:10.1111/j.1600-
19 0889.2009.x.

20 Kumar A., Sarin M. M., and Srinivas B. (2010) Aerosol iron solubility over Bay of Bengal:
21 Role of anthropogenic sources and chemical processing. *Mar. Chem.* **120**,
22 doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2010.04.005.

1 Lefevre N., and Watson A. J. (1999) Modeling the geochemical cycle of iron in the oceans
2 and its impact on atmospheric CO₂ concentrations. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* 13,
3 727-736.

4 Liu X., and Millero F. J. H. (2002) The solubility of iron in seawater. *Mar. Chem.* **77**, 43-54.

5 Luo C., Mahowald N. M., and Corral J. del (2003) Sensitivity study of meteorological
6 parameters on mineral aerosol mobilization, transport, and distribution. *J. Geophys. Res.*
7 **108** (D15), 4447, doi:10.1029/2003JD003483.

8 Luo C., Mahowald N., Meskhidze N., Chen Y., Siefert R., Baker A., and Johansen A. (2005)
9 Estimation of iron solubility from observations and a global aerosol model. *J. Geophys.*
10 *Res.* **110**, D23307, doi:10.1029/2005JD006059.

11 Luo C., Mahowald N., Bond T., Chuang P. Y., Artaxo P., Siefert R., Chen Y., and Schauer
12 J. (2008) Combustion iron distribution and deposition. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **22**,
13 GB1012, doi:10.1029/2007GB002964.

14 Luo C., and Gao Y. (2010) Aeolian iron mobilization by dust-acid interactions and their
15 implications for soluble iron deposition to the ocean: a test involving potential organic
16 acidic species. *Environ. Chem.* **7**, 153-161, doi:10.1071/EN09116.

17 Mackie D. S., Peat J. M., McTainsh G. H., Boyd P. W., and Hunter K. A. (2006) Soil
18 abrasion and eolian dust production: Implications for iron partitioning and solubility.
19 *Geochem. Geophys. Geosystems.* **7**, Q12Q03, doi:10.1029/2006GC001404.

20 Mahowald N. M., Baker A. R., Bergametti G., Brooks N., Duce R. A., Jickells T. D.,
21 Kubilay N., Prospero J. M., and Tegen I. (2005) Atmospheric global dust cycle and iron
22 inputs to the ocean. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* 19, GB4025,
23 doi:10.1029/2004GB002402.

1 Mahowald N. M., Engelstaedter S., Luo C., Sealy A., Artaxo P., Benitez-Nelson C., Bonnet
2 S., Chen Y., Chuang P. Y., Cohen D. D., Dulac F., Herut B. Johansen A.M., Kubilay N.,
3 Losno R., Maenhaut W., Paytan A., Prospero J. M., Shank L. M., and Siefert R. L. (2009)
4 Atmospheric iron deposition: global distribution, variability, and human perturbations.
5 *Annu. Rev. Mar. Sci.* **1**, 245-278.

6 Mahowald N., Lindsay K., Rothenberg D., Doney S. C., Moore J. K., Thornton P.,
7 Randerson J. T., and Jones C. D. (2011) Desert dust and anthropogenic aerosol
8 interactions in the Community Climate System Model coupled-carbon-climate model.
9 *Biogeosci.* **8**, 387-414, doi:10.5194/bg-8-387-2011.

10 Mendez J., Guieu C., and Adkins J. (2010) Atmospheric input of manganese and iron to the
11 ocean: Seawater dissolution experiments with Saharan and North American dusts. *Mar.*
12 *Chem.* **120**, 34-43. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2008.08.006.

13 Meskhidze N., Chameides W. L., and Nenes A. (2005) Dust and pollution: A recipe for
14 enhanced ocean fertilization. *J. Geophys. Res.* **110**, D03301, doi:10.1029/2004JD005082.

15 Moore J. K., and Doney S. C. (2007) Iron availability limits the ocean nitrogen inventory
16 stabilizing feedbacks between marine denitrification and nitrogen fixation. *Global*
17 *Biogeochem. Cycles* **21**, GB2001, doi:10.1029/2006GB002726.

18 Moore J. K., and Braucher O. (2008) Sedimentary and mineral dust sources of dissolved
19 iron to the world ocean. *Biogeosci.* **5**, 631-656.

20 Moore J. K., Doney S. C., and Lindsay K. (2004) Upper ocean ecosystem dynamics and iron
21 cycling in a global three-dimensional model. *Global Biogeochem. Cycle.* **18**,
22 doi:10.1029/2004GB002220.

1 Mori I., Nishikawa M., Shimizu A., Hayasaki M., and Takasuga T. (2011) Solubility of Iron
2 in aerosol collected during Kosa (Asian dust) events in Japan. *SOLA* **7A**, 5-8,
3 doi:10.2151/sola.7A-002.

4 Moxim W. J., Fan S-M., and Levy II, H. (2011) The meteorological nature of variable
5 soluble iron transport and deposition within the North Atlantic Ocean basin., *J. Geophys.*
6 *Res.* **116**, D03202, doi:10.1029/2010JD014709.

7 Newell R. E., and Evans M. J. (2000) Seasonal changes in pollutant transport to the North
8 Pacific: the relative importance of Asian and European sources. *Geophys. Res. Letts.* **27**,
9 2509-2512.

10 Oakes M., Rastogi N., Majestic B. J., Shafer M., Schauer J. J. , Edgerton E. S., and Weber
11 R. J. (2010) Characterization of soluble iron in urban aerosols using near-real time data.
12 *J. Geophys. Res.* **115**, D15302, doi:10.1029/2009JD012532.

13 Okin G. S., Baker A. R., Tegen I., Mahowald N. M., Dentener F .J., Duce R. A., Galloway J.
14 N., Hunter K., Kanakidou M., Kubilay N., Prospero J. M., Sarin M., Surapipith V.,
15 Uematsu M., and Zhu T. (2011) Impacts of atmospheric nutrient deposition on marine
16 productivity: Roles of nitrogen, phosphorus, and iron. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **25**,
17 GB2022, doi:10.1029/2010GB003858.

18 Ooki A, Nishioka J., Ono T., and Noriki S. (2009) Size dependence of iron solubility of
19 Asian dust particles. *J. Geophys. Res.* **114**, D03202, doi:10.1029/2008JD010804.

20 Özsoy T., and Saydam A. C. (2001) Iron speciation in precipitation in north-eastern
21 Mediterranean and its relationship with Sahara dust. *J. Atmos. Chem.* **40**, 41-76.

22 Parekh P., Follows M. J., and Boyle E. A. (2004) Modeling the global ocean iron cycle,
23 *Global Biogeochem. Cycles.* **18**, doi:10.1029/2003GB002061.

1 Paris R., Desboeufs K. V., Formenti P., and Chou C. (2010) Chemical characterization of
2 iron in dust and biomass burning aerosols during AMMA-SOP0/DABEX: implications
3 for iron solubility. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **10**, 4273-4282.

4 Paris R., Desboeufs K. V., and Journet E. (2011) Variability of dust iron solubility in
5 atmospheric waters: Investigation of the role of oxalate organic complexation. *Atmos.*
6 *Environ.* **45**, 6510-6517.

7 Prospero J. M. (1999) Long-term measurements of the transport of African mineral dust to
8 the southeast United States: Implications for regional air quality. *J. Geophys. Res.* **104**
9 (D13), 15,917-15,927.

10 Rahn K. A. (1981) Relative importances of N. America and Eurasia as sources of Arctic
11 aerosol. *Atmos. Environ.* **15**, 1447-1455.

12 Rahn K. A., and Lowenthal D. H. (1984) Elemental tracers of distant regional pollution
13 aerosols. *Science* **223**, 132-139.

14 Raiswell R. and Canfield D. E. (2012) The iron biogeochemical cycle past and present.
15 *Geochemical Perspectives*, 1, 1-214.

16 Schroth A. W. Crusius J., Sholkovitz E. R., and Bostick B. C. (2009) Iron solubility driven
17 by speciation in dust sources to the ocean. *Nature Geosciences* **2**, doi:10.1038/NGE0501.

18 Sedwick P. N., Church T. M., Bowie A. R., Marsay C. M., Ussher S. J., Achilles K. M.,
19 Lethaby P. J., Johnson R. J., Sarin M. M., and McGillicuddy, D.J. (2005) Iron in the
20 Sargasso Sea (Bermuda Atlantic Time-series Study region) during summer: Eolian
21 imprint, spatiotemporal variability, and ecological implications. *Global Biogeochem.*
22 *Cycle*, **19**, doi:10.1029/2004GB002445.

1 Sedwick, P. N., Sholkovitz E. R., and Church T. M. (2007) Impact of anthropogenic
2 combustion emissions on the fractional solubility of aerosol iron: Evidence from the
3 Sargasso Sea. *Geochem. Geophys. Geosystem.* **8**, Q10Q06, doi:10.1029/2007GC001586

4 Séguret M. J. M., Kocak M., Theodosi C., Ussher S. J., Worsfold P. J., Herut B.,
5 Mihalopoulos, Kubilay N, and Nimmo M. (2011) Iron solubility in crustal and
6 anthropogenic aerosols: The Eastern Mediterranean as a case study. *Mar. Chem.* **126**,
7 229-238, doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2011.05.007.

8 Shi Z. B., Woodhouse M. T., Carslaw K. S., Krom, M. D., Mann G. W., Baker A. R., Savov
9 I., Fones G., Brooks B., Jickells T. D., and Benning L. G. (2011) Minor effect of physical
10 size sorting on iron solubility of transported mineral dust. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **11**, 14309-
11 14338.

12 Sholkovitz E. R., Sedwick P. N., and Church T. M. (2009) Influence of anthropogenic
13 combustion emissions on the atmospheric deposition of soluble aerosol iron to the
14 oceans: Empirical estimates for island sites in the North Atlantic Ocean. *Geochim.*
15 *Cosmochim. Acta.* **73**, 3981-4003.

16 Siddaway J. M., and Petelina S. V. (2011) Transport and evolution of the 2009 Australian
17 bushfire smoke in the lower stratosphere observed by OSIRIS and Odin. *J. Geophys. Res.*
18 **116**, D06203, doi:10.1029/2010JD015162.

19 Siefert R. L., Webb S. M., and Hoffmann M. R. (1996) Determination of photochemically
20 available iron in ambient aerosols. *J. Geophys. Res.* **101**, D9, 14,441-14,449.

21 Siefert R. L., Johansen A. M., and Hoffmann M. R. (1999) Chemical characterization of
22 ambient aerosol collected during the southwest monsoon and intermonsoon seasons over

1 the Arabian Sea: Labile-Fe(II) and other trace metals. *J. Geophys. Res.* **104** (D3), 3511–
2 3526.

3 Spokes L. J., Jickells T. D., and Lim B. (1994) Solubilisation of aerosol trace metals by
4 cloud processing: A laboratory study. *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **58**, 3281-3287.

5 Spokes L. J., and Jickells T. D. (1996) Factors controlling the solubility of aerosol trace
6 metals in the atmosphere and on mixing with seawater. *Aquatic Geochem.* **1**, 355-374.

7 Srinivas B., Sarin M. M., and Kumar A. (2011) Impact of anthropogenic sources on aerosol
8 iron solubility over the Bay of Bengal and the Arabian Sea. *Biogeochem.*, doi
9 10.1007/s10533-011-9680-1

10 Stumm W., and Morgan J. J. (1996) *Aquatic chemistry: chemical equilibria and rates in*
11 *natural waters*, 3 rd edition. Wiley-Interscience, 1022 p.

12 Tagliabue A., Boop L., and Aumont O. (2009) Evaluating the importance of atmospheric
13 and sedimentary iron sources to the Southern Ocean biogeochemistry. *Geophys. Res.*
14 *Letts.* **36**, L13601, doi:10.1029/2009GL038914.

15 Theodosi C., Markaki N., and Mihalopoulos N. (2010a) Iron speciation, solubility and
16 temporal variability in wet and dry deposition in the Eastern Mediterranean. *Mar. Chem.*
17 **120**, 100-107. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2008.05.004.

18 Theodosi C., Markaki N., Tselepidis A., and Mihalopoulos N. (2010b) The significance of
19 atmospheric inputs of soluble and particulate major and trace metals to the eastern
20 Mediterranean seawater. *Mar. Chem.* **120**, 154-163, doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2010.02.003.

21 Trapp J. M., Millero F. J., and Prospero J. M. (2010) Trends in the solubility of iron in dust-
22 dominated aerosols in the equatorial Atlantic trade winds: Importance of iron speciation
23 and sources. *Geochem Geophys Geosyst.* **11**: Q03014, 10.1029/2009 GC002651.

1 Upadhyay N., Majestic B. J., and Herckes P. (2011) Solubility and speciation of atmospheric
2 iron in buffer systems simulating cloud conditions. *Atmos. Environ.* **45**, 1858-1866,
3 doi:10.1016/j.atmosenv.2011.01.010.

4 Ussher S. J., Achterberg E. P., and Worsfold P. J. (2004) Marine biochemistry of iron,
5 *Environ. Chem.* **1**, 67-80, doi:10.1071/EN04053.

6 Wagener T., Pulido-Villena E., and Guieu C. (2008) Dust iron dissolution in seawater:
7 Results from a one-year time-series in the Mediterranean Sea. *Geophys. Res. Letts.* **35**,
8 L16601, doi:10.1029/2008GL034581.

9 Witt M., Baker A. R., and Jickells T. D. (2006) Atmospheric trace metals over the Atlantic
10 and South Indian Ocean: Investigation of metal concentrations and lead isotope ratios in
11 coastal and remote marine aerosols. *Atmos. Environ.* **40**, 5435-5451.

12 Witt M. L. I., Mather T. A., Baker A. R., De Hogg J. C. M., and Pyle D. M. (2010)
13 Atmospheric trace metals over the south-west Indian Ocean: Total gaseous mercury,
14 aerosol trace metal concentrations and lead isotope ratios. *Mar. Chem.* **121**, 2-16,
15 doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2010.02.005.

16 Wu J., Rember R., and Cahill C. (2007) Dissolution of aerosol iron in surface waters of the
17 North Pacific oceans as determined by a semicontinuous flow-through method. *Global*
18 *Biogeochem. Cycles* **21**, GB4010, doi:10.0129/2006GB002851.

19 Zhen Y., Zhuang G., Brown P. R., and Duce R. A. (1992) High-performance liquid
20 chromatographic method for the determination of ultratrace amounts of Fe (II) in
21 aerosols, rainwater, and seawater. *Anal. Chem.* **64**, 2826-2830.

1 Zhu X., Prospero J. M., Savoie D. L., Millero F. J., Zika R. G., and Saltzman E. S. (1993)
2 Photoreduction of iron(III) in marine mineral aerosol solutions. *J. Geophys. Res.* **98** (D5),
3 9039-9046.

4 Zhu X. R., Prospero J. M., and Millero F. J. (1997) Diel variability of soluble Fe(II) and
5 soluble Fe in North African dust in the trade winds at Barbados. *J. Geophys. Res.* **102**,
6 21,297-21,305.

7 Zhuang G., Duce, R. A., and Kester D. R. (1990) The dissolution of atmospheric iron in
8 surface seawater of the open ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.* **95**, C9, 16207-16216.

9 Zhuang G. S., Yi Z., Duce R. A., and Brown P. R (1992a) Link between iron and sulfur
10 cycles suggested by detection of Fe(II) in remote marine aerosols. *Nature* **355**, 537-539.

11 Zhuang G. S., Yi Z., Duce R. A., and Brown P. R (1992b) Chemistry of iron in marine
12 aerosols. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 6, 161-173.

13

1 **Figure Captions**

2

3 **Figure 1.** Site location map of the 26 studies from around the globe. Data are plotted on
4 Figs. 3-9. References cited below are numbered to correspond to the numbers on the
5 location map in this figure. The letters after the location numbers refer to the type of
6 leaching methods used in each study: **B** for batch method, **F_T** for flow-through method
7 and **B/F_T** for a combination batch and flow-through method. The second group of
8 letters refer to type of leaching solutions used; they include Milli-Q (MQ) deionized
9 water, other deionized water (DI), formate pH 4.5 buffer (formate), ammonium acetate
10 pH 4.7 buffer (acetate) and seawater (SW at pH ~ 8). The next and last set of numbers
11 refers to the number of data point in each reference. For example, “**1-B-MQ-32**” means
12 that site 1 has batch leach data using Milli-Q water for 32 samples. Data sources are as
13 follows:

14 **(1-B-MQ-32)** Kumur et al., 2010; **(2-B-MQ-49)** Kumar and Sarin, 2010; **(3-B-formate-**
15 **26)** Johansen and Hoffmann, 2003; **(4-B-formate-16)** Siefert et al. 1999; **(5-B-MQ-31**
16 **and SW-19)** Chen et al. 2006; **(6-B-SW-28)** Hsu et al., 2005; **(7-B-MQ-40)** Hsu et al.,
17 2009; **(8-B-MQ-26)** Chuang et al., 2005; **(9-B/F_T-MQ-8 and SW-9)** Aguilar-Islas et al,
18 2010; **(10-B/F_T-SW-15)** Wu et al. 2007; **(11-F_T-DI-54 and SW-54)** Buck et al., 2006.
19 **(12-B-formate-59)** Chen, 2004; **(13-B-dilute HCl-18)** Zhuang et al. 1992; **(14-B-**
20 **formate-23)** Siefert et al. 1996; **(15-F_T-DI-43 and SW-41)** Buck et al, 2010a; **(16-B-**
21 **acetate-65)** Baker et al., 2006 a; **(17-B-acetate-36)** Baker et al., 2006 b. **(18-B-formate-**
22 **29)** Chen and Siefert, 2004; **(19-B-formate-17)** Johansen et al., 2000; **(20-B-pH 2 NaCl-**
23 **25)** Trapp et al., 2010; **(21-F_T-DI-18)** Sedwick et al. 2007; **(22-F_T-DI-93)** Church,

1 Sedwick and Sholkovitz, unpublished data; (23-B-pH 1 NaCl-25) Zhu et al., 1997; (24-
2 B-pH 1 HNO₃-12) Witt et al., 2006; (25-B-acetate-7 and pH 1 HNO₃-7) Witt et al.
3 2010; (26-F_T-SW-7) Bowie et al., 2009.

4
5 **Figure 2.** Site location map for the unpublished data of Baker and Powell. Data come
6 from 291 samples from twelve cruises in the eastern North Atlantic Ocean and South
7 Atlantic Ocean between 2003 and 2008. Batch leaching with pH 4.7 ammonium acetate
8 buffer solution was employed.

9
10 **Figure 3. (A)** Full-scale plot of fractional solubility of aerosol iron (%Fe_S) versus total
11 aerosol iron loading (Fe_T) for the global set of 1091 samples from sites shown in Figures
12 1 and 2. **(B)** Expanded x- and y-scale plot of same data as in part (A). The majority of
13 samples are plotted as ‘closed circles’. Different and distinct symbols are used to
14 highlight four sites (5, 7, 8 and 14) that show %Fe_S values that lie above the main set of
15 data points. The deionized water leach data from the Sargasso Sea are plotted with a
16 distinct ‘open circle’ symbol; data from this site (21) will be used as ‘benchmark’ set of
17 data for Figures 3 to 7 and 9. With respect to the x-axis, a Fe_T value of 1000 ng/m³
18 equates to a dust load of ~28 μg/m³; this assumes that the aerosol is 3.5% Fe, a value that
19 is typical of the upper continental crust and mineral dust from the desert regions. All the
20 data from the twenty-six studies in Fig. 1 and from the 16 cruises to the Atlantic Ocean in
21 Fig. 2 can be found in Table S1 in the supplemental material at
22 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1575/1912/5104>. Three studies contain Fe solubility data for the
23 same samples using both deionized water and seawater leaches (Chen et al., 2006; Buck

1 et al., 2006, 2010); only the deionized water leach data are presented in this figure. Data
2 from a study that only used a seawater leach are plotted in this figure (site 6, Hsu et al.,
3 2005). Some data in the compilation have been excluded from parts (A) and (B). These
4 include data from Zhuang et al. (1992) (site 13), because their use of strong mineral acid
5 yields %Fe_S values that are significantly higher than the data from the other studies. The
6 seven data points from Bowie et al. (2011) for site 26 are not plotted.

7

8 **Figure 4** Plot of %Fe_S vs. Fe_T for the eight coastal studies in the Middle East/Indian
9 Ocean/Asia region. Sites (1-8) range from the Gulf of Aqaba to South Korea. **(A)** Full-
10 scale plot of the whole data set which consists of ~ 217 data points from sites 1-8 in Fig.
11 1 (see Fig. 1 caption for corresponding references). The deionized water leach data of the
12 Sargasso Sea plot are shown as a ‘benchmark’ set of data. Data from sites 14 in the
13 continental United States (formate leach, gray squares) are shown for comparison. **(B)**
14 Expanded x- and y-axis scales of Part (A) with symbols and leaching information for
15 each site. Key refers to part B only.

16

17 **Figure 5.** Plot of %Fe_S vs. Fe_T for all the studies in the open Atlantic Ocean. **(A).** full
18 scale plot of the whole data set which consists of ~706 data points from sites 10, 12,
19 15,17, 18, 19, 21, 22 and 23 in figure 1 and all the sites in Fig. 2. Sites in Fig. 2 yield
20 ~291 unpublished data points of Baker and Powell. One data point in Part (A) at x = 9.5
21 and y = 95 is not plotted. **(B).** Expanded x- and y-axis scales of Part (A). Distinct
22 symbols are used for the three sites (15, 18 and 23) that show %Fe_S values that lie above
23 the main set of points. The deionized water leach data of the Sargasso Sea plot are shown

1 as a 'benchmark' set of data. Unpublished data of Baker and Powell are highlighted with
2 their own symbol (gray circle).

3

4 **Figure 6.** Plot of %Fe_S vs. Fe_T vs. for unpublished Atlantic Ocean data of Baker and
5 Powell (291 samples, batch leaching with acetate buffer) and unpublished data of Church,
6 Sedwick and Sholkovitz (93 samples; flow-through leaching with deionized water). The
7 latter samples were collected in the Sargasso Sea and at the Tudor Hill atmospheric tower
8 in Bermuda. Published data from the same authors are also plotted (Baker et al., 2006
9 a,b; Sedwick et al., 2007). (A) full-scale plot of all the data. (B) Expanded x- and y-axis
10 scales of Part (A). The deionized water leach data of the Sargasso Sea (site 21) are shown
11 as a 'benchmark' set of data.

12

13 **Figure 7.** Plot of Fe_T vs. %Fe_S for all the North Pacific open ocean studies. The whole
14 data set consists of 132 data points from sites 9-13 in Fig. 1. The deionized water leach
15 data for the Sargasso Sea (site 21) are shown as a 'benchmark' set of data

16

17 **Figure 8.** Plot of Fe_T vs. %Fe_S for samples from the Gulf of Aqaba (Chen et al., 2006)
18 (A). Comparison of data from pH 5.5 deionized water leach and pH 8.16 seawater leach.
19 (B). Expanded x and y scale of the seawater data.

20

21 **Figure 9.** Plot of Fe_T vs. %Fe_S for 84 samples from Southern Hemisphere (SH) ocean
22 and equator. The deionized water leach data of the Sargasso Sea (site 21) are shown as a
23 'benchmark' set of data. Cruise tracks are in Figure 2. The majority of the SH samples

1 come from the unpublished data of Baker and Powell in Table S1. Data points from site
2 26 (Bowie et al., 2011) were inadvertently left off. Five of seven data points fall between
3 x values of 5 and 11 and y values of 0.2 and 2.5.

4
5 **Figure 10. (A).** Results of two end-member conservative mixing model derived from
6 equation (3) in section 4.2 of the text (see supplemental material for details). Eight case
7 studies are shown, each with different end-member values for total aerosol iron loading
8 (Fe_T) and fractional solubility of aerosol iron ($\%Fe_S$). Cases I–VIII have the following
9 end-member values of Fe_T ($ng\ m^{-3}$ air) for the anthropogenic and mineral dust end-
10 members respectively: I (50, 1000), II (50, 500), III (10, 2000), IV (50, 2000), V (100,
11 2000), VI (50, 2000), VII (50, 2000) and VIII (50, 500). Cases I–VIII have the following
12 end-member values for $\%Fe_S$ for the 'combustion' and 'lithogenic' end-members
13 respectively: I (50, 1), II (50, 1), III (50, 1), IV (50, 1), V (50, 1), VI (60, 1), VII (60, 0.5)
14 and VIII (30, 0.5). Note that case V differs from case III in having a 10-fold higher
15 aerosol iron loading for the combustion end-member (100 vs.10 $ng\ m^{-3}$ air). The other
16 cases have $Fe_T = 50\ ng\ m^{-3}$ air for the combustion end-members. **(B).** The fractional
17 solubility of iron ($\%Fe_S$) vs. total atmospheric iron loading (Fe_T) for shipboard aerosol
18 samples collected near Bermuda in the Sargasso Sea. The data and the two end-member
19 mixing model trend are from Sedwick et al. (2007). Samples were collected in July-
20 August 2003 (open squares), April 2004 (open circles), and June 2004 (filled triangles).
21 **(C).** Total atmospheric iron loading (Fe_T) versus the mass ratios of V/Al (x100) and
22 Ni/Al (x100) of same total bulk aerosol samples as in part B (from Sholkovitz et al.,

- 1 2009). Flow-through leaching with pH ~ 5.5 deionized water was employed for all
- 2 samples in parts B and C.