

Interactive comment on “Evaluation of asymmetric Oxygen Minimum Zones in the tropical Pacific: a basin-scale OGCM-DMEC V1.0” by Kai Wang et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 29 September 2020

Subject

Wang and co-authors investigate the impacts of physical supply and biological consumption of dissolved oxygen (DO) on the dynamics and asymmetry of the OMZs in the tropical Pacific. They perform 4 numerical experiments to evaluate the sensibility of the mid-depth oxygen concentration to these aspects in their model, OGCM-DMEC v1.0. The physical supply is evaluated through the background diffusion parameterisation (that the authors test by changing a partial mixing parameter) and the effects of biological consumption on oxygen are tested by changing the C:O utilization ratio. The final aim is to advance their model capacity to simulate the oceanic oxygen cycle, and to explore the mechanisms driving the asymmetric OMZs in the tropical Pacific (introduction, 1.67-68).

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Relevance of the subject

To understand the physical and biological processes responsible for the asymmetry of tropical Pacific OMZs is a topic of great interest for climate modelers, which has currently not been solved.

General comments

However, in its present form, the conclusions of this study bring no new clues of understanding, and do not explore any mechanisms. The authors conclude that both physical supply and biological consumption impact the OMZs extend and vertical structure, which, according to them, has been the subject of numerous previous papers (see I.188-190 or I.219-220).

While it is a promising approach to explore the DO budget term by term, I recommend to enlarge the analyses to other variables (by characterizing the tropical ocean dynamics with vertical sections of horizontal currents for example, and by giving insights of plankton and nutrients mean-state and variability) in order to explore the mechanisms at play when increasing the background diffusion or decreasing the biological consumption.

Besides I have some reservations about the use of a basin-scale model of the Pacific limited at 20°S and 20°N to study the Pacific OMZs. It seems not very appropriated to model OMZ borders, as these latter are found far north of 20°N . If the aim of the study is to investigate the importance of DO physical supply, one may not ignore the ventilation processes at play in the OMZ borders (Bettencourt et al., 2015). And even in a case of tropical study (as reflected by the analyses restricted to 15°S - 15°N), one may not ignore the critical representation of the equatorial undercurrent (EUC) to model the tropical OMZ structure (Busecke et al., 2019). As both processes are highly resolution-dependent (see for example Fig. 16 in Berthet et al., 2019), I am surprised to find no discussion and no bibliography on the questions of the appropriate model resolution needed to get a realistic OMZ structure.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Results

Model description: The parameterization of the oxygen cycle needs to be described with more details. It would help the reader to analyse the results.

Validation: In its present form, the model validation may be completed by showing physical currents and temperature/salinity mean state and variability (at the surface and with a vertical section along latitudes), OMZ inter-annual variability, ventilation at the OMZ boundaries (as mesoscale activity has been shown to shape the OMZ).. .

As stated I.70, the OGCM-DMEC V1.0 has shown a good model-data agreement in the carbon cycle for the tropical Pacific Ocean (Wang et al., 2015). This is a good point if the model was validated on carbon cycle, but the paper needs a true validation on oxygen.

Specific comments

I.14: 'DO' is used in the abstract, but not defined

I.53: I would recommend to add the following study to justify that circulation play a dominant role in regulating the dynamics of tropical OMZs: Busecke, J. J. M., Resplandy, L., & Dunne, J. P. P. (2019). The Equatorial Undercurrent and the oxygen minimum zone in the Pacific. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL082692>

I.54-57: And what about the horizontal resolution of the model ? Using an ESM with a high-resolution ocean ($1/10^\circ$), Busecke et al. (2019) show that a realistic representation of the Equatorial Undercurrent (EUC) dynamics is crucial to represent the upper OMZ structure and its temporal variability. They demonstrate that coarser ESMs commonly misrepresent the EUC, leading to an unrealistic "tilt" of the OMZ (e.g., shallowing toward the east) and an exaggerated sensitivity to EUC changes overwhelming other important processes like diffusion and biology.

This last aspect would be interesting for your discussion.

I.61: “A fully coupled basin-scale physical-biogeochemical model (OGCM-DMEC V1.0) was developed for the tropical Pacific (Wang et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2009).” → are you using a regional configuration centered on the Pacific ocean ? Or is it a global model ?

I.78: “The model domain is between 30°S and 30°N” → thus it is not “global”. This has to be clarified, as OGCM generally means ocean GLOBAL circulation model.

Moreover if your domain extends between 30°S-30°N: why did you crop your horizontal maps at 15°N while Fig. 2b clearly not catch OMZ northern border between 200-600m (which seems far north) ? I would suggest to enlarge the northern border up to 20°N (at least, as your sponge layers are in the 20°-30° bands).

“and zonal resolution is 1°.” → have you checked how your EUC behaves ?

I.86-87: precipitation (gpcp) and wind stress (NCEP) forcings are not consistent ?

I.90: “an interannual simulation for the period of 1978-2000, and analyze model output for the period of 1981-2000.” → could you give some insights about the interannual behaviour of your OMZs ?

I.96: DON is not defined

I. 107-109: please clarify your computation of the vertical mixing term: “the vertical mixing term that is calculated by three subroutines (Chen et al., 1994).” → I guess that to be splitted in 3 subroutines is not the main characteristic of the hybrid scheme of Chen et al. (1994). It would be interesting to mention why you add this mixing scheme in your model from a physical point of view. Following the abstract of Chen et al. (1994), this hybrid vertical mixing scheme “helps to produce more realistic velocity profiles in the eastern and central equatorial Pacific. This is mainly due to the improved parameterization of interior mixing related to the large shears of the Equatorial Undercurrent”, which seems to me an important aspect when modelling the OMZ. Or it would be important to tell the reader (still from their abstract) that this scheme “is capable of

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

simulating the three major mechanisms of vertical turbulent mixing in the upper ocean, that is, wind stirring, shear instability, and convective overturning.”

I. 137: as you aim to determine the respective roles of physics and biogeochemistry in the oxygen biases, it would be helpful to have some basic validations on horizontal / vertical circulations (for example, a vertical section of zonal jets along the latitudes) and nutrients affecting the oxygen budget in your model (phyto- and zoo-plankton, detritus, DON, ammonium, nitrate).

I.142-145: Regarding your sensitivity experiments, it would be helpful to clarify how the initial DON remineralization constant and O:C utilization ratio were determined.

Moreover, are you increasing the oxygen supply through mixing only in the OMZ region or in the whole Pacific basin ? Could you justify your choices ? Could you elaborate on your “variable Pm” ? How does it vary ?

I.179-180: “We first compare the distribution of DO over 300-500 m between reference run and Exp3. The reference run produces much large volume of suboxic waters (<20 mmol m⁻³) in both the ETNP and ETSP where the two OMZs are merged (Figure 6a).”

The reader would appreciate if the oxygen average for your “ref” experiment in Fig. 6 may be comparable with observations: Fig. 2 (right column) shows the 200-600 m mean, and Fig. 6 the 300-500 m mean. These 2 averaged layers (200-600 vs 300-500 m) are quite different in terms of volume of equatorial suboxic waters, so, please, could you add a 3rd column in Fig. 2 with the 300-500 m mean in WOA ?

I. 181: “Exp3 performs well in reproducing the sizes and locations of two asymmetric OMZs” → the use of quantitative metrics (OMZ volume, maximal horizontal extent) would reinforce this conclusion.

I.195: regarding the small decrease you detect in the ETNP-OMZ in exp3 (Fig. 7c): what do you obtain with exp4 ? Is this decrease linked with coastal processes ? If yes, how ?

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Figures

Figure 1: legend of Ps, PL, Zs, ZL, Ds, DL is missing.

Figure 2: it seems weird to me to study the Pacific OMZ but to not catch its spatial extend entirely: why don't you extend your simulated regions at least to 25°S and 25°N (shifting your sponge layers between 30° and 35° for example), and to the coasts of America (~70°W to get both northern and southern parts of the Pacific OMZ) ?

Figures 3 (and 10): as the paper focus on the asymmetry between the northern and southern part of the Pacific OMZ, and as its aim is to show how they differ, the meridional means between 10°S-15°N seem not appropriate. I would recommend to split the analyse in two, one for each OMZ (south and north). As it is, Fig. 3 does not allow to properly evaluate how the model reproduces the vertical structure of the OMZ against observations.

Same comment for Fig. 10 (left column), and this analyse does not allow to investigate any mechanisms.

Bibliography

Berthet, S., Séférian, R., Bricaud, C., Chevallier, M., Voltaire, A., & Ethé, C. (2019). Evaluation of an online grid-coarsening algorithm in a global eddy-admitting ocean biogeochemical model. *Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems*, 11, 1759–1783. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019MS001644>

Bettencourt, J. H., López, C., Hernández-García, E., Montes, I., Sudre, J., Dewitte, B., et al. (2015). Boundaries of the Peruvian oxygen minimum zone shaped by coherent mesoscale dynamics. *Nature Geoscience*, 8, 937–940. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ngeo2570>

Busecke, J. J. M., Resplandy, L., & Dunne, J. P. P. (2019). The Equatorial Undercurrent and the oxygen minimum zone in the Pacific. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 46. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019GL082692>

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-105>, 2020.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

