

“Improved ocean circulation modeling with combined effects of surface waves and M2 internal tides on vertical mixing: a case study for the Indian Ocean” By Zhuang et al.

In this study, the authors incorporated three mixing schemes into the ocean general circulation model, namely non-breaking surface-wave-generated turbulent mixing(NBSW), the mixing induced by the wave transport flux residue(WTFR), and the internal tide-generated turbulent mixing(IT) along with Mellor-Yamada 2.5 mixing scheme. This study of quantifying the role of wave and tide-induced mixing in an ocean model is a timely and valuable contribution. However, the authors are unable to represent it in terms of value addition to its scientific contributions. There are many gaps in this study starting with ocean model configurations and their different experiments.

Author partially responded to my above comment. In terms of scientific contribution author respnsed "Furthermore, addition to the scientific value, the results in this study are helpful to improve the accuracy and timeliness of the global ocean numerical prediction for the national or regional forecasting agencies, because the MASNUM ocean model is able to depict more complete physical processes. In our opinion, it is important to study the NBSW- and IT-induced mixing for promoting the development of the ocean and coupling models."

How does the accuracy and timeliness of the global ocean numerical prediction for the national or regional forecasting agencies are helpful ?? the MASNUM ocean model is able to depict more complete physical processes HOW ???

The introduction lacks the present status of the state of the art model’s mixing schemes with details and its drawbacks in the Indian Ocean. The authors are unable to give the scientific objectives to be achieved in this study as compared to the previous works. The representation of the internal tide-generated turbulent mixing is not new, in fact, it’s been introduced by Simmons et al. (2004) in a global Ocean General Circulation model. The author did not mention this work and its related works (Nagai and Hibiya (2015)).

Again same fro my above comments. Author did not give any insight about what are outstanding issues in terms of mixing schems in the ocean model with respect to Indian Ocean.For example overflow schems in the Indian Ocean models to represnt Red Sea salty water yet an outstanding issues. I agree that the internal tide-generated turbulent mixing is not explicity implimented but yet it shows significiant improvement, however, in the presnt study as such no significant improvement can be found.

Also, the authors presented the results only up to 130 m which does not represent insight into the mixing process related to internal tides since its effect could be seen in the deeper layers. A very

recent study by Lozovatsky et al. (2022) showed that the observed eddy diffusivity in the ocean pycnocline over the southeastern BoB is likely related to internal-wave generated turbulence.

Authors gave explanation that below 130 m the model simulations shows too warm when compared with WOA13. How much warm? what is the exact value? 3, 4, 5 C????

The explanation given for this warm simulation as "The reason is that the Haney equation (Haney, 1971) was used to modify the climatologic surface heat flux and improve the large-scale thermal coupling of ocean and atmosphere, but a disadvantage of the Haney modifying method is the destruction of the heat balance, so excessive heat may be transmitted into the ocean interior."

This explanation of temperature restoration is the only reason as given by the authors may not be correct. It seems MASNUM model has fundamental problem to reproduce it even in the control simulation. Author should give concrete scientific evidence what the exact cause of warm temperature simulation. The other existing Indian ocean regional model simulation based on MOM, ROMS, HYCOM etc does not show too warm temperature below 130 m as the authors mentioned.

I understand its climatological simulation but the eddy diffusivity in the ocean pycnocline as a model diagnostics can be obtained from all these sensitivity experiments. This will give some preliminary idea how much it differs with respect to instantaneous values given in Lozovatsky et al. (2022)

In line-121-22 the authors wrote "... , the mode-1 M2 internal tides, which mainly originate from regions with steep topographic gradients, are considered..." . Doesn't it imply that the mixing will be more over the steep topographic gradients?. But the author did not show any results related to this.

Reply: Explanation with respect to my above comment looks fine.

The authors implemented the mixing schemes in the momentum equations. This implementation will also affect the dynamics as well. But the authors did not show any results on whether any changes are there in the circulations. The authors should show a few results about how the upper ocean currents improved with implementations of NBSW, IT, and WTFR mixing schemes.

With reference to my above comment, although the author gave comparison plot with OSCAR but its very hard to see any changes between Exp-1, Exp-2 and Exp-3. It looks no significant change of circulation is induced with the inclusion of the stated schemes explicitly as a subroutine in the momentum equation.

It will be good if the authors also can show spatial comparisons of model-simulated temperature diffusivities with Argo observations (Whalen et al. 2012). I am unable to recommend this manuscript for publication in this form. However, it can be considered for publication if they address my above queries and the below comments.

The argumet given for not to give the comparion results not acceptable. I agree this will not give exact values but at least will give the spatial distribution pattern. Author must show the spatial comparion.

1. Line 173-174: “The initial temperature and salinity are interpolated based on the annually mean Levitus data with the horizontal resolution of 1° by 1° and 33 vertical layers..” Which Levitus data authors have used? Should give the version and reference.

Reply: Levitus94 data for Indian Ocean model initalization may not give realisit climatological spatial pattern. Its too old and I guess hardly any representative data went onto this. I think author must use the recent WOA atlas may be 2013 or 2018 for the initalization.

2. The author used a regional model in which the lateral boundary condition is very important for any basin-scale model, particularly for the Indian Ocean which is affected by the Indonesian Throughflow in the eastern boundary. The author did not give any details about how the boundary condition is prescribed. Is it a boundary condition with a sponge layer? The authors should provide the details about the lateral boundary conditions used in this study.

Reply: Explnation with respect to my above comment looks fine.

3. Line 175-180: The initialization strategy and the experimental details are also not very clear. It looks like the author used a cold start and then inter-annual forcing from NCEP/NCAR (1948-2021). This means its inter-annual simulations. On the other hand, they wrote “The model is integrated from the quiescent state for 10 climatological years. The simulated temperature in the last 1 year is compared with the monthly World Ocean Atlas 2013 (WOA13) climatologic data” . This implies it's only 10 years of simulations. It's confusing what experiments the authors exactly carried out. It seems 10 years of simulation may not be sufficient to reach the steady-state. The authors should give the evidence that the model reached steady-state in 10th year of simulation.

Reply: Explnation with respect to my above comment looks fine.

4. The author used MASNUM wave spectrum model simulations to get the inputs for the NBSW parameterizations scheme they incorporated. But how good the model simulations compare with observations?

Reply: Explnation with respect to my above comment looks fine.

5. In Figures 2c and 3c authors represented it as the IT-generated turbulent mixing scheme based on Exp-3 but in this experiment, NBSW is also included, then how can it be an IT-generated turbulent mixing scheme?

Reply: Explnation with respect to my above comment looks fine.

6. In Figures 2 and 3 for the vertical profiles of the monthly mean vertical temperature diffusive terms, the author choose to show the results for 10.5 °S, and for the temperature comparison, they showed 30.5 °S. What is the physical basis to choose these sections? Authors should show such results for the Arabian Sea and Bay of Bengal as well.

Reply: Partially responded. If the authors compared it for Arabian Sea and Bay of Bengal, then why they did not gave the figures ?

7. In Figure 4 in exp1& 4 why the model does show the cooler temperature in the thermocline depth region? In general, over the Indian Ocean, almost all forced model shows warm bias (Rahaman et al. 2020). Although the thermocline bias was reduced in Exp 2 and 3, it became reversed with similar magnitude why does it so? Why there is no difference between exp-1 and exp-4 in Figures 4 and 5? Does it mean WTFR does not impact temperature simulations? Authors should show such results for the Arabian Sea and Bay of Bengal as well.

Reply: The reson given for cooler therocline temp in Exp-1 as " The reason for the cooler temperature in the thermocline depth region in Exp 1 should be that the multi-year monthly mean surface forcing fields were smaller than the actual values, which leads to insufficient heat transfer from the atmosphere to the ocean. After 10 climatologic years modeling, the temperature in the ocean interior became cooler obviously than the WOA13 data." This explanation does not show any scientific argumnet. Not fully convinced. How does multi-year monthly mean surface forcing fields were smaller than the actual values will affec the simulation ? The author made the forcing climatology I guess from 1948-2021.

Similarly the explnation why the bias reversed in Exp-2 with respect to Exp-1 is also not complete. Author should give scientiifc evidence may be the complete heat budget for the explnation.

8. Figure 8 What is the physical basis of choosing the different zone? Looks like the present defined zones will not give true representation, for example in zone 1 since the dynamics and thermodynamics are different in the Arabian Sea, Bay of Bengal and South China Sea, hence the mixing characteristics are also different. I suggest excluding the regions outside of the Indian Ocean such as South China Sea and Atlantic Ocean as included in the present zone 2 and zone 3. I also suggest the author should select the zones based on past studies or based on the dynamics and thermodynamic properties of the Indian Ocean basin.

Reply: In that case there should be a zone in the equatorial region. It will not be good to include ITF in zone 2, zone 2 must be devided in to two zone.

9. How the RMSE is statistically robust when the authors used the seasonal cycle and computed the RMSE?
10. As already pointed out in the case of the thermocline in the MLD bias given in Figure 9 for Exp-1 too looks not consistent with the previous works. In general OGCMs simulates deeper MLD in the Indian Ocean (de Boyer Montégut et al. 2007). A very recent study by

Pottapinjara et al. (2022) too shows similar results. Hence, how the MLD simulation, in this case, shows shallower than observations? The authors need to explain why the model simulated MLD is shallower as compared to observations. Also, the criteria used to compute MLD is not very widely used. The authors did not provide any reference to compute MLD or any explanation why they choose the 1 °C criterion to compute MLD.

Reply: "..... In fact, from Figures 10 one can see that, the obviously shallower MLDs are generally in the Antarctic Circumpolar Current (ACC) regions, where the simulated vertical mixing from the original experiment is weak dramatically." What about the Indian Ocean particularly in the Arabian Sea and Bay of Bengal.