

Interactive comment on “Influence of Bulk Microphysics Schemes upon Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) Version 3.6.1 Nor’easter Simulations” by Stephen D. Nicholls et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 18 August 2016

GENERAL COMMENTS: The paper analyzes the role of five microphysical schemes of the numerical model WRF3.6.1 upon seven cases of "nor'esters". I think that the paper is well formed and it has interesting topics.

I think that the spin-up time of 72 hours is too long for a simulation without any kind of assimilation. A test with a shorter spin up (12 hours) could be recommendable.

A microphysical comparison with observations could be useful because this topic is the main focus of the paper. Is it possible to retrieve data from radar or satellite platform? For example in <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JAS-D-13-0107.1> the microphysical comparison has been performed using data from TRMM satellite platform.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

Line 133: w is the mixing ratio of rain?

Line 203: Not Fig. 4 but Fig. 5

Figs. 5-6-7: insert letters in the panel to easy the reading of section 3.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-151, 2016.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

