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Review Koeve et al.

Scientific Significance: Excellent
Scientific Quality: Excellent
Scientific Reproducibility: Good
Presentation Quality: Excellent

This paper examines the relation between radiocarbon (D14C) and age in a new, interesting, and useful way by introducing the concept of preformed 14C-age. Scientists have long known that the c14 age and the real age of a subsurface water mass are not the same due to finite air-sea gas exchange. But I haven’t seen such a clear presentation of the issue before.

The paper is useful for climate modelers and paleoceanographers working with radiocarbon. I recommend publication as is, or, if a revision is undertaken, with consideration
of my minor comments listed below.

Page 7035: Observationalists could object to calling models “the method of choice”.

Line 18: I think capital Δ¹⁴C is usually refered to after correction for δ¹³C.

Page 7040: Definitions of ¹⁴C-age^pre and ¹⁴C-age^decay: Line 18: I don’t understand why DIC^pre is in the denominator. Using the decay function C(t)=C(t=0)*exp(-t/τ), where τ is 8033 years and solving for t=τ*ln(C/C(t=0)) it seems to me that C(t=0) should be in the denominator, which, in this case should be ¹⁴C-DIC^pre at the surface. Do I miss something?

Line 23: Those ratios must have completely different orders of magnitude. ¹⁴C-DIC^pre/DIC^pre ~ Rstd~10^-12, while (DIC + ¹⁴C-DIC^decay)/DIC ~ 1. Am I missing something?

Page 7042: line 24: “background mixing coefficients” are these in addition to a tidal mixing component? Please specify. If so, I suggest to refer to k_bg rather than k_v.

Page 7045: line 18 “two water masses of different age”: Which values were used in Fig. 5? 0 and 2000 years?

Page 4047: lines 15-17: “for CO2 the equilibration time is governed by the product of the time scale of gas exchange (order of one month) and the ratio CO2−3 /COaq2 (10–15 in the surface ocean)” Why?

Page 7048 line 12: I don’t see negative ages in Fig. 1b

Page 7049 lines 23-25: I suggest to add “except at the surface.”

Page 7053 lines 10-15: I suggest to discuss Schmittner (2003, EPSL 6702 1-10) who examines sea ice effects on bottom water radiocarbon.

The above review was not influenced by reading reviewer #1 and #2’s comments. With regard to reviewer #1’s comments I don’t agree with him/her that there is nothing new
here. To my knowledge the concept of preformed c14-age has not been proposed nor used before. This is therefore, in my opinion, a new contribution, even if much of the text sounds like “trite textbook points”. I also think that the paper is appropriate for GMD since it proposes a new way to analyze model output.
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