

## ***Interactive comment on “An isopycnic ocean carbon cycle model” by K. M. Assmann et al.***

**A. Gnanadesikan (Referee)**

anand.gnanadesikan@noaa.gov

Received and published: 11 September 2009

This paper introduces a new ocean biogeochemical model embedded in an isopycnal ocean model. As someone who has been working on a similar effort to this one I appreciate the scope of what is reported here and felicitate the authors on their accomplishment. I strongly support publication of this paper after some revision. I have listed some suggestions below to improve the motivation, description and comparability of the model. Those suggestions which involve citing my own papers are to be taken as strictly optional!

### 1. Motivation:

Using an isopycnal model is motivated on p. 1027 in terms of being an "alternative formulation" of the primitive equations. Although there is some reference to avoiding "artificial mixing and advection" in the ocean interior, this statement is less well fleshed

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



out than it could be.

Our motivation at GFDL for using an isopycnal model is really based on three facts. First (as reported in Winton, Hallberg and Gnanadesikan, JPO, 1998) isopycnal models do a much better job at simulating overflows than level coordinate models, a fact that has clear implications for the the simulation of water masses. Second, using rotated diffusion tensors in level coordinate models to do isopycnal mixing results in up-gradient fluxes, which can lead to unphysical (negative) values of biogeochemical tracers that have sharp gradients in the vertical (Gnanadesikan, Ocean Modelling, 1999). Finally, in time-varying flows, advective overshoots and truncation can lead to spurious diffusion (Griffies, Pacanowski and Hallberg, MWR, 2001). Since the rate at which biological cycling within the ocean occurs is strongly determined by vertical diffusion (Gnanadesikan et al., GBC, 2004), limiting this spurious diffusion is potentially critical to getting the right rates of chemical cycling.

## 2. Description

A. The major limitation of the description is the lack of a description of the mixed layer and its interaction with the ocean interior. Given the importance of the mixed layer depth for determining light limitation and nutrient supply, a more detailed description needs to be provided here, preferably with a table of any parameters that determine this exchange. (Doing this would also help set up the DIAPYC run). In this regard, what is done with respect to penetrating shortwave radiation?

B. Additionally, it would be good to give a mean value for the background diffusive coefficient in the 300-500m range in the tropics vs. the bottom values. Again this is to help make the models easily comparable without requiring someone to go and calculate N.

C. The iron cycles across models are not well described. I would like to see at least a contour plot of surface iron and values for the total iron flux to the ocean and total iron inventory in the ocean. Models currently being run differ by an order of magnitude in

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



terms of the iron fluxes applied.

### 3. Model validation and comparability

A. Using full-depth nutrient fields for the Taylor diagram will somewhat overstate the goodness of fit. It would be useful to also add points for surface phosphate, surface nitrate, and surface silicate. The values reported here are pretty good. A comparison with Schneider et al. (Biogeosciences, 2008) would be a good idea (with the appropriate caveat that the models in Schneider are coupled). Also do a comparison with chl and log(chl). This will probably not be all that great, but serve as a comparison point for future studies. Alkalinity fields are also available from the GLODAP site.

B. One of the challenges in comparing models is to understand the role of different limitations. I would like to see a calculation of the production-weighted limitation from light, phosphate and nitrate, and iron. This would be useful for comparing the IRON, ABS and DIAPYC runs as well.

C. We have recently published (Dunne, Sarmiento and Gnanadesikan, GBC, 2007) a synthesis of particulate export of POC, PIC and opal that you might find useful. I am not a big fan of the Laws et al. export fluxes, as they don't make oceanographic sense (depending on which flux product is used there is either no contrast between the southern subtropics and the Southern Ocean, or between the Southern subtropics and the equator). The other reviewer is correct that the exact depth of export is important (is it the depth of the euphotic zone?).

D. A major question one would have with this model is whether the use of the isopycnal model changes the solution significantly compared to a level-coordinate model. If there is a comparable solution it would be useful to present it for a few fields, in particular would be the zonally averaged export and primary productivity. I think this would really strengthen the paper, but if no strictly comparable result exists it should not hold up publication.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

E. Add correlation and regression coefficients to the anthropogenic uptake in Figure 13.

#### Questions and comments

A. p. 1040: You state that sea ice is impermeable. Is this taken to be true if there is any sea ice? In the OCMIP2 models, for example fluxes were scaled down according to the sea ice concentration.

B. p. 1045: It is stated that the "full incoming shortwave radiation" is applied to the mixed layer. Isn't there some decay over the layer? Shouldn't the \*average\* downwelling radiation be used?

C. p. 1049: "a more sophisticated parameterization is hard to come by" In Galbraith et al. (Biogeosciences Discussion, 2009) we have a discussion of how to deal with luxury uptake. Though I would say that "a well validated parameterization" remains hard to come by!

#### Comments on other reviewer

A. CFCs and radiocarbon. I agree that CFCs should be simulated, as this involves a fairly short run. However, radiocarbon can take thousands of years to come to equilibrium. I don't think the paper should be held up for the second set of simulations.

B. The turnover time for the entire ocean is not longer than 5000 years! Radiocarbon gives an underestimate of the turnover time, as it takes so long to equilibrate, and the average radiocarbon concentration of the deep ocean is -170 permil.

C. Regarding spinup time scales. 1000 years may be sufficient for some parts of the simulation (surface nutrient fluxes, carbon fluxes). In fact in Galbraith et al. (2009) we find that after 400 years the surface nutrients are changing by less than 1% per century. That said, I agree with the reviewer that the criteria used should be stated.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 2, 1023, 2009.

C256

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

