

# ***Interactive comment on “A standard test case suite for two-dimensional linear transport on the sphere: results from a collection of state-of-the-art schemes” by P. H. Lauritzen et al.***

**P. H. Lauritzen et al.**

pel@ucar.edu

Received and published: 9 December 2013

Dear reviewer,

The authors would like to thank you for your thorough review of our manuscript. Below (in red font) is a point-by-point response to your comments.

- Reviewer: ‘This is a well written and detailed paper which evaluates 19 state-of-the-art transport schemes belonging to different well known families of methods using the standard test set by Lauritzen et al (Geosci. Model Dev., 2012). A concise review is given for the transport scheme types considered and there

Interactive  
Comment

are plenty of references for further studying. Each test is adequately described and overall there is sufficient information for a reader who is either developer or modeller to understand the implications of different choices for numerical transport schemes. For this reason I find this paper a very useful addition to the literature.

This paper can be accepted as it is with few minor corrections (typos). One general comment is that although there is a clear value on these 2D tests, since the paper deals with global atmospheric/oceanic modelling, I would have preferred to see a three-dimensional version of this evaluation study. Not only because in these areas we are dealing with 3D transport but also because in practice operational models at very early stages of development start as 2D models and after being coded in 3D they evolve significantly. It happens that, in practice, not much effort can be spent maintaining their 2D counterparts up-to-date, especially when a model matures. So it is not always easy to go back and test the same things.'

**Reply:** The authors certainly agree that the 3D extension of the test case suite is very interesting; especially because many schemes are anisotropic in transport with radically lower-order methods in the vertical. It is, however, beyond the scope of this manuscript.

A recent publication by Kent et al. (2013) presents, loosely speaking, a 3D extension of the 2D test case suite used here.

Kent, Ullrich, and Jablonowski, 2013: Dynamical core model intercomparison project: Tracer transport test cases. *QJRMS*. In press.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



- Reviewer: 'My minor corrections are: 1. Abstract: comma (,) at the end of first paragraph should become full-stop (.)'

GMDD

6, C1946–C1949, 2013

Reply: Done

- Reviewer: '2. Page 4987 last paragraph 2nd line: change "as as" to "as".'

Interactive Comment

Reply: Done

- Reviewer: '3. Page 4989, 1st paragraph of section 2: I think "scaler" should change to "scalar".'

Reply: Done

- Reviewer: '4. Page 4990, equation (4): for consistency with (1), (2) I think that v should change to upper-case V.'

Reply: Done

- Reviewer: '5. Page 4999, first sentence section 2.2.1: Semi-LAgrangian to semi-Lagrangian'

Full Screen / Esc

Reply: The capital "A" is to make the CSLAM acronym clearer: Conservative Semi-LAgrangian Multi-tracer (CSLAM).

Printer-friendly Version

- Reviewer: '6. Page 5002, section 2.2.4, 4th line: change  $D\varphi/dt$  to  $D\varphi/Dt'$

Interactive Discussion

Reply: Done

Discussion Paper



- Reviewer: '7. Page 5014, section 3.3, 1st paragraph, 6th line: correct the time interval in parenthesis, it is typed wrongly.'

Reply: Done

- Reviewer: '8. Page 5018, 2nd paragraph, 3rd line: change "scheme" to "schemes".'

Reply: Done

- Reviewer: '9. Page 5019, 6th line: The sentence starting as "A purely Lagrangian ..." needs a preposition e.g. "In a purely Lagrangian ..."

Reply: Done

- Reviewer: '10. The term (Semi-) Lagrangian is used in different parts of the manuscript. Why not semi-Lagrangian which is the standard name and also used in some other parts of the text?'

Reply: In the parts of the manuscript where '(semi-)Lagrangian' is used the text applied to both fully Lagrangian and semi-Lagrangian schemes. E.g. the equations of motion for fully Lagrangian and semi-Lagrangian schemes are identical but differ through the discretization where fully Lagrangian methods trace the same set of parcels throughout the simulation whereas semi-Lagrangian methods periodically change to a different set of parcels.'

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

