

## ***Interactive comment on “Comparison and validation of global and regional ocean forecasting systems in the South China Sea” by X. Zhu et al.***

**X. Zhu et al.**

zhuxm@nmefc.gov.cn

Received and published: 20 April 2016

We sincerely appreciate the reviewer for the constructive comments and suggestions. We addressed these concerns in the revision by following all the suggestions to significantly improve the manuscript in the following manner: 1) We have explained relative words or sentences and answered all the questions of the reviewer. 2) We have clarified the introductions to the satellite data, SLA, MGDSST, AVHRR in section 2.1. 3) We redraw or modified relative figures mentioned by the review, such as Fig. 1,2,4,5,6,7,8,10. 4) We revised all the styles, language, typos, references 2. Specific scientific comments Line 17: explain or define better what you are referring to with the term "mesoscale activities" We have explained it by adding the words "such as ocean fronts, Typhoon, and mesoscale eddy," Line 74: explain better what you mean with the phrase "where they can then impact budgets of the tracers"

C1

We have changed it to "where they can then impact budgets of heat, mass, momentum and biogeochemical properties". Line 107: if the satellite data you use are from 2012, what is "April 2014" referring to? The starting date of the SSALTO/DUACS new data system? The satellite datasets, DUACS 2014 version, are distributed to users in April 2014, which including the data from 1993 to present. We only use the data of 2012 to compare and validate our systems' results in this paper. Line 109: quoting from the user manual of the L4 altimeter data you are using (and that you cite [http://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/fileadmin/documents/data/tools/hdbk\\_duacs.pdf](http://www.aviso.altimetry.fr/fileadmin/documents/data/tools/hdbk_duacs.pdf)) "Change of resolution: in DUACS 2014 version, after the feedback from users, the Mercator grid projection with 1/3 x 1/3 spatial resolution (Global product) is abandoned. The DUACS 2014 Global products are directly computed on a Cartesian 1/4 x 1/4 spatial resolution." Therefore, depending which data you are using, it may be incorrect saying that the products are sampled from the Mercator gridded data so please, specify better if you are using the DUACS 2014 data or a former version (and which one). From the following discussion it seems you are using the DUACS 2014 data. Yes, we use the DUACS 2014 data in this paper and have modified it in the revised manuscript. Line 115: quoting the JMA database description of the MGDSST (<http://neargoos1.jodc.go.jp/rdbmdb/format/JMA/mgdsst.txt>): "Merged satellite and in-situ data Global Daily Sea Surface Temperature (MGDSST): The MGDSSTs are analysed at the Office of Marine Prediction of the JMA with 1/4-degree grid resolution on the near realtime basis. SSTs derived from satellite's infrared sensors (AVHRR/NOAA) and microwave sensor (AMSR-E/AQUA), and in-situ SST (buoy and ship) are used in the analysis." The list of satellite products here does not match the list of satellite products you mention in the paper. Thanks, we have revised it to match the description of the MGDSST in the website. Line 122-127 please clarify in the paper that the reason for which you are using the "AVHRR-only" data is because the production of the AVHRR+AMSR data ended in 2011. Otherwise questions might arise on the impact of the usage of "AVHRR+AMSR" data in your analysis and how the results might differ from the results using "AVHRRonly" data. Thanks, we have clarified it in the revised manuscript by

C2

adding the words "Since the production of the AVHRR+AMSR data ended in 2011" at line 145. Line 137-138: just for my education: why to filter out the tidal signal you use a period of 25 hours and not, for example 24 hours? Same, why did you use a 25-hour period to calculate the daily average? It is because the periods of some of the major diurnal tidal constituents are longer than 24 hours. Actually 26 hours is better than 25 hours to filter out the tidal information. Line 140 and following: you mention that there were 5 cruises to measure the temperature/salinity data but you use data from only two of them for the TS distribution comparison? Why only two? Why do you use the data from these particular cruises? Are the data from the remaining three cruises significantly different in some ways? What changes/improvements/impacts do you expect when using all the data available? We did have compared both two systems with other three cruises, the results are almost the same. In order to save space, we only show two of them in this paper. The Qiongdong cruise is conducted in the coastal area, the Nansha cruise is conducted in the deep area. We also compared all the measured TS data from 5 cruises with the two system, please see Fig. 9 and section 3.2.3 Correlation ship between model and in-situ. Line 244: be more specific than "little stronger than AVISO" For example you can add a time-series-like plot showing the basin-averaged, minimum and maximum velocities (in separated components  $u$  and  $v$ ) for the two models and the satellite observations in the four months. On the x-axis you have the 4 time steps (Jan, Apr, Jul, Oct.), on the y-axis 3  $u$ -velocities (min, max, basin-averaged) for each of the two models and the observation. Same for  $v$ . Alternatively, at least quote the basin-averaged velocities in the text. From the Figure only, it is very difficult to distinguish the length of the vectors hence to have an estimation of the magnitude of the velocities. Moreover, while on lines 243 you say that AVISO shows currents that are smaller than MO or SCSOFS, at lines 249 you say that AVISO has comparable velocities to MO and SCSOFS has smaller velocities so there is an incongruence in the text. Thanks. It is not correct, we have deleted the words "except that the current speeds are a little stronger than AVISO". Line 260: explain why in your opinion in spring the two models and the observation show each a different type of Kuroshio intrusion.

C3

Is this maybe due to some physics effects modelled differently in the two models or boundary conditions not implemented in the best way in the two models. Can you also explain why this effect is visible mainly in spring? It is obviously the types of Kuroshio intrusion are different from each among the three results, you can refer the paper Nan et al. (2011a). And AVISO, MO, and SCSOFS show the leaking path, looping path, and leaping path in spring, respectively. Actually, I have not researched much on this problem. I think it is an interesting scientific problem, and additional work need to do to study it in detail. But this is out of the scope of this paper. In my opinion, it may due to the surface wind forcing are different for the two models. Since the wind is weaker in spring than other seasons in this area, the wind forcing used in both two models may not agreement well with the real wind. Line 271: I would prefer to use the word "temporal" instead of "phase" bias in this case. The word phase is generally more used when speaking about angles. Do you have an explanation about this temporal behaviour of SCSOFS? Thanks, we have changed the word from "phase" to "temporal". It may due to the surface wind forcing, we will double check about it. At line 281 you say that the SST has been assimilated in SCSOFS but this is not mentioned when you describe which data are assimilated in the model in lines 187 and 188. Yes, the SST data has been assimilated in SCSOFS by the thermal feedback method to correct net surface heat flux (Barnier et al., 1995). We have modified the description at Line 189 and 190. At line 286 you say that the SST variation is larger in winter and smaller in summer for both MO and SCSOFS but when looking at Figure 4 this appears to not be true: the absolute magnitude of the variation is much larger for SCSOFS (where you see large blue and red areas) than for MO (where you see prevalent green everywhere) and has the same values (but with opposite signs) for summer and winter; in winter the area that show a large variation is simply larger so it is better to specify the basin-averaged variation is larger. What it seems more correct is that SCSOFS overestimates the SST in winter and underestimates the SST in summer, therefore has a more uniform trend of the SST through the year with respect to MO Thanks, we have modified it at line 286. Line 287 you quote 3 values for RMSE for each of the models saying that they are the

C4

maximum minimum mean monthly but it is no clear what do you mean with "monthly": are these the averaged values over the 4 months or do they correspond to a specific month? In any case please quote the values for each month for a better comparison of the performances of MO and SCSOFS Thanks, we have modified it at line 298 in the revised version. Line 303: you say that the isohaline is located at 50 km for in-situ data and SCSOFS and at 20 km for MO but this big difference is not so evident in Figure 6, therefore from Figure 6 it cannot be concluded that SCSOFS performs better than MO when compared to in-situ data. A plot of a vertical profile of TS and the TS bias for let's say 20km, 50 km and 70 km can clarify better the performances of the models in this case. We have changed the plot of SCSOFS in Figure 6, and revised the position of MO from 20km to 40km. Line 375 Define what is W W is the Okubo-Weiss parameter (Xiu et al., 2010) defined as:  $\bar{\omega} = \frac{1}{2}(\zeta^2 - \sigma^2)$  Where

Line 387 Why do you use a period of 24 years for SCSOFS and just one year for MO? Since we have got only the year of 2012 data from MO, only one year of MO data is available in this study, and 14 years, from 2001 to 2014 for SCSOFS. Line 391 You say that all the three results show a small number of eddies in autumn and a larger number of eddies in spring but this is not true for MO when looking at table 1, where MO predicts 13 total eddies for both spring and autumn Thanks, we have revised it as:" As for the seasonal distributions (figures not shown), all three data have most eddies in spring. Both AVISO and SCSOFS have less eddies in fall and more cyclones than anti-cyclones in spring and fall, and all three have less cyclones than anti-cyclones in summer." Line 395 explain better the oversimplification of SLA calculation for MO and why SCSOFS does not suffer from this. Oversimplification here means SLA calculated by only one year's MO data averaged and extracted from SSH. This may introduce great error for SLA and the eddy identification. 3. Style comments and suggestions 3.1 General Be consistent with the space between the value and the unit of measure, for example in line 28 you write "1200m" and line 156 you write "0.16 m". As a general reference, the NIST Guide for the Use of the International System of Units (SI) states "7.2 Space between numerical value and unit symbol: In the expression for the value of a quantity,

C5

the unit symbol is placed after the numerical value and a space is left between the numerical value and the unit symbol. The only exceptions to this rule are for the unit symbols for degree, minute, and second for plane angle (...) in which case no space is left between the numerical value and the unit symbol." Thanks, we have modified all the expressions in the revised paper. Change all the "northeastly" in "northeasterly" , "southwestly" in "southwesterly" and all the similar words. Thanks, we have changed them in the revised paper. Use consistently "coastal currents" or "Coastal Currents" (check for examples line 50-51) Thanks, we have changed them in the revised paper. Be consistent in using 1/4 or 0.25 for the horizontal resolutions (for example lines 116 and 119) Thanks, we have changed them in the revised paper. In the section about MO (2.4), you keep calling the model PSY4V1R3 systematically without any mention of Mercator Ocean and in the later sections this name (PSY4V1R3) disappears. Please introduce at some point in section 2.4 a clarification like : the PSY4V1R3 configuration described here is indicated for as MO model through this paper. Thanks, we have clarified it in the revised paper. 3.2 References Bell, 2015 is never used; Chu, 2001 is never used; Daudin, 2013 never used; Thanks, we have deleted these references. Weiss 1991, not used; Thanks, we have added the citation at line 395. Line 167: move the reference to SODA to the line where you first talk about SODA, i.e. line 91; Thanks, we have added the citation at line 395. Line 179: The reference for Barnier 1995 is missing. In the reference there is a Barnier 2006. Please check. Thanks, we have added the reference for Barnier et al., 1995 at line 485. Line 185: the reference for Wang et al 2012 is missing. Thanks, we have added the reference for Wang et al., 2012 at line 638 Please check Line 201: move the reference to the Arakawa C-grid to where you first introduce the Arakawa C-grid, i.e. line 152. We have moved it to line 164 Line 228 : the reference WOA2005 is missing We have added the references Antonov et al., 2006 and Locarnini et al., 2006 3.3 Figures In general increase the size of the x/y labels especially in the maps and use higher resolution files so that the image does not loose sharpness when zooming in. Fig 1: change the colours for the cruises paths and the mooring station because now they cannot be easily distinguished from

C6

the background Moreover, please indicate in Fig.1 more of the channels and seas you name in lines 30-33 to facilitate the nonexpert readers in understanding the unique geographical features of the SCS. Reduce the width (or the size in general to keep the aspect ratio) because the label of the scale is outside the printing area so it is missing in a printed version of the paper Thanks. We have tried to change colours for the cruises paths and the mooring station to the yellow, red and others, found the pink, green and black are the best colors to distinguish from the background. We also have added the names of channels and seas, such as Karimata Strait, Balabac Strait, Mindoro Strait, Java Sea, Sulu Sea, and East China Sea, and reduced the width. Fig.2: report in a separate plot the mean maximum and minimum AGV because it is currently difficult to compare them from the maps shown in Fig.2 or report these values explicitly in the text. Increase the sizes of the labels on the legend and axes. Use higher resolution files. The unity of measure is missing from the scale Also SSH bias maps can be added (MO minus AVISO and SCSOFS minus AVISO) to evidence better the behaviour of the two models with respect to the observations (analogous to Fig.4 maps) Thanks. We have changed color shaded of all plots from Sea Surface Height to the speeds of AVG in Fig. 2. Since we have not mentioned Sea Surface Height in the text. And we also have increased the sizes of the labels on the legend and axes and added the unity of measure of the scale. Maybe you can also change the color map for Figure 4: a red/white/blue (RWB) map is usually more appropriate to represent bias. For example in the actual maps the green color can correspond to bias values of both +0.5 and -0.5; using a RWB map would make more clear the areas where the bias is positive and where it is negative. Thanks, we have changed it follow your suggestion. Fig.5-6-7-8: units missing from the colorbar Thanks, we have added it. Fig.9: the correlation plots for salinity show a less good linear relationship between MO and SCSOFS and data with respect to the same plots for temperature? Did you try to plot the correlations in different depth ranges to see if the plots show a better linear correlation and if there is a depth range for which the correlation is not good and this degrades the overall linear relationship? Yes, we have tried to plot it in different depth, and got almost the

C7

same results. So we just show the whole linear relationship in this paper. It is actually that the correlation for salinity is less than those for temperature. Fig 10: change the colormap so that also the pale yellow structures can be distinguished better from the white background Thanks, we have changed it follow your suggestion. Fig.11: explain what are the white areas on the map The white areas mean the SST increasing.

3.4 Language and typos Line 12-13: change "Mercator Ocean...in China" in "the global Mercator Ocean Operational System , developed and maintained by Mercator Ocean in France and the regional South China Sea Operational Forecasting System (SCSOFS) by the National Marine Environmental Forecasting Center (NMEFC) in China". I think it is better to underline that MO is a global ocean forecasting system developed by Mercator Ocean, a scientific institution in France. Line 22: change "AVISO data" in "satellite observations": at this point it is not yet clear to a medium reader what are AVISO data; change "results compared in above" in "outcome of the results comparison" Line 42-43: change "in the NSCS....in the SCS" in "is present in the NSCS, while a semiannual/biennial change from a cyclonic gyre regime in winter to an anti-cyclonic gyre regime in summer can be observed in the SCS" Please note that the word "biannual" is ambiguous; some use it with the meaning of "twice per year" in which case it is better to use the word "semiannual", others use it to say "every two years", in which case it is better to say "biennial". Line 136 change "abnormal" in "outlier" Line 142/263: change "See" in "see" Line 145-147: change "All the measured...correlation analysis" in "The TS data collected from all the 5 cruises will be used to perform a correlation analysis of each of the simulated predictions of MO and SCSOFS models with the observations." Line 149: change "Ocean" in "Oceanic" and modelling in "modeling". The first correction comes from the original name of ROMS while the second is to align the spelling of the word to the American English rule that you are using in other words (for example as in "analyzed") Line 208: the value "-1x10<sup>10</sup> m<sup>2</sup>s<sup>-1</sup>" seems odd, please check in case there is a typo. Line 216: remove the comma before the parenthesis Line 218 add a "-" between along and track Line 221: since it is the first time you mention SSH add the full name: Sea Surface Height (SSH) and remove the full

C8

name from line 232 Line 267 there must be a typo in "the range of large is less than". Please rewrite. Change "leading" in "anticipating" Line 317 change "ship" in "analysis" Line 320 remove "of relativity" Line 354 substitute "hot" with important Line 367 substitute "SST deceasing" with "SST decrease" Line 415 there is a typo: the first SCSOFS should be changed in MO

Thanks, we have changed all the typos in above in the revised paper.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.nat-hazards-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/nhess-2016-60/nhess-2016-60-AC1-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-60, 2016.