

Interactive comment on “Impact of ocean coupling strategy on extremes in high-resolution atmospheric simulations” by C. M. Zarzycki et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 11 December 2015

This paper is a short study that points out some spurious effects when the surface fluxes in an atmospheric GCM are computed on a coarser grid. In particular, this leads to wind stress vectors that are not always aligned with the surface wind, leading to a mis-representation of extreme events. The problem is demonstrated here with an atmosphere-only GCM, but it should remain present in coupled mode.

This problem may not occur very frequently in practice : not all atmospheric models compute surface fluxes on the ocean grid, and it is probably relatively rare to have a coarser ocean resolution, especially now that surface datasets at 0.25° exist. Still, it is something to be aware of when designing the interface of a GCM (along with the converse issues for the ocean with a coarse atmospheric grid). The problem pointed out may not be immediately apparent as the mean state is not impacted, and the paper

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



shows it in a clear and pedagogic way. It should therefore be a valuable addition to the literature on model development.

Minor comments:

1. Title could be more specific (fluxes on coarse surface grid... rather than "coupling strategy" when imposed SSTs are used here).
2. Maybe a comment could be made in the intro or model section on why the fluxes are computed on the surface model grid in the first place ? (History of higher-resolution surface grid presumably). This would fit with the conclusion that fluxes should always be computed on the finest grid.
3. Conclusion, first line : "atmospheric extreme climatology" is a bit awkward: distribution of extremes in atmospheric circulation ? Or just "strength of tropical cyclones" ?
4. Figure 5 : Legend does not explain panels (c,f) type of simulation. Note that there are few differences between the (e,f) panels only because the SST used has no small-scale structure; there would presumably be more impacts in the presence of oceanic front or eddies.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8, 7983, 2015.

GMDD

8, C3317–C3318, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

