

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Hydrographic situation during cruise M84/3 and P414 (spring 2011) in the Mediterranean Sea” by D. Hainbucher et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 7 January 2014

This can potentially be a rather good paper as well as a very relevant one for the Mediterranean oceanography. Unfortunately, it suffers from a number of weaknesses and not very well defined scope of the work. Thus, as it can be seen from my general and specific comments which follow, major revision is needed in order to make it publishable to OS.

General comments:

The paper aims at putting the results of two oceanographic basin-wide cruises in the context of the Mediterranean circulation and its evolution. I think at least that only that aim of the paper has sense instead of a mere description of results. However, in order to do that one has to describe rather well long-term Mediterranean circulation variability and sub-basin scale features. The paper does not succeed to do that since,

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



[Interactive
Comment](#)

apart from the rather poor description of EMT no other decadal variability has been mentioned. Here I refer to the BiOS mechanism in the Eastern Mediterranean (see e.g. Borzelli et al., 2009, Gacic et al., 2011, Gacic et al., 2013) and the Western Mediterranean Transition – WMT (Schroeder et al., 2009). Effects of the thermohaline changes observed in the Adriatic can be quantified only by knowing the present BiOS phase i.e. Ionian basin-wide circulation mode. Therefore, only by understanding in which phase were these two decadal variabilities one can interpret the cruise results in 2011. As far as the sub-basin scale features in the specific period of the campaign are concerned, detailed description can be given analyzing altimetric data which are normally available to oceanographic community. In addition, in the abstract authors specify that one focus of the paper was to compare the geostrophic velocities and ADCP data which cannot be self sustained scope of the paper.

The main weakness of the paper is that authors interpret collected data in a “two-dimensional” fashion, i.e. horizontally along the transect neglecting the fact that the Mediterranean is strongly asymmetric. These considerations could have been done at least in the Ionian from the Poseidon cruise and so some horizontal maps of the principal water masses such as LIW and AW is essential for understanding the BiOS mode. This would help very much in determining water mass pathways which is not necessarily along the trans-Mediterranean section.

Comparison of the geostrophic velocities and ADCP measurements keeping the reference level equal in both sub-basins (EMed and WMed) does not justify the conclusion that in the WMed the large-scale flow is mainly geostrophically balanced while in the EMed the ageostrophy is much more important. The differences can simply be due to the fact that sub-basin scale features in the EMed are deeper than those in the WMed. Authors should use the ADCP measurements at a certain depth as absolute velocity, then add to this value the geostrophic shear and see to what extent geostrophically sheared absolute velocities differ from ADCP measurements at other levels determining the ageostrophic contribution. Another important shortcoming of the applied

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

geostrophic method was that authors were able to compute only the vertical shear of the geostrophic component perpendicular to the section.

Specific comments:

In the Abstract authors repeat the same statement with a slightly changed wording: “The focus of our analysis are the water mass properties, also in the context of the recently observed variability, and a comparison between the velocity fields observed using a vessel-mounted ADCP and those calculated from the observed density fields.” and: “Here, our focus is a discussion of the observed water mass properties analysed through T –S diagrams and through an Optimum Multiparameter (OMP) analysis. Additionally, ADCP velocities are compared to geostrophic calculations.”

Authors have to be more coherent in using the water mass acronyms as presented in: <https://www.ciesm.org/catalog/WaterMassAcronyms.pdf> . They for example use for Atlantic Water MAW in one part of the paper and in the other AW.

Introduction:

The sentence: “As a consequence, which adds to the differences in bathymetry as well as forcings existing between the two sub-basins, the WMed and EMed show distinct differences both in their hydrographic conditions and circulation.” cannot be understood, please reformulate.

Page 2402, line 6: Deep waters in the WMed did experience large changes because of the preconditioning thermohaline variations and the event was named as WMT – Western Mediterranean Transition (see various papers by Schroeder, and Gacic et al., 2013).

Page 2403: As said in the line 4 it seems that BOUM was restricted to specific area.

Page 2403: lines 10-15: The major goal of the cruises in the Northern Ionian and S. Adriatic should be, if authors took into consideration the central role played by the Ionian in driving the Mediterranean overturning circulation, to analyze the present state

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



[Interactive
Comment](#)

of the Ionian basin-wide circulation and BiOS and its effect to the AdDW production.

Page 2406: line 29: Theocharis and not Teocharis;

Page 2408 – 2409: These long considerations of water mass characteristics are rather tedious. Please summarize somehow!

Page 2410: “During the EMT, this kind of shape of the T –S diagram (“peaking”) was prominent in the Ionian Sea only in the northern part of the Eastern Mediterranean Ridge, the principal entrance for water of Aegean origin (Roether et al., 2007). Remarkably, now it can be found in the whole Ionian Sea (Fig. 5b), but it is characterized by a much less pronounced range between minima and maxima.” The fact that in Roether et al. (2007) there was no signs of the “peaking” in the Ionian can simply be due to the fact that Roether’s data do not have such a good synoptic coverage of the Ionian (bi-dimensionality versus three-dimensionality! and non-synoptic data in Roether et al.) which is a very important aspect considering the BiOS variability.

Page 2412: Map of horizontal distribution of contribution of various water masses in the Ionian should be very useful, considering mainly LIW, AW and AdDW.

Larger departures from the geostrophy in the EMed should somehow be explained, assuming obviously that the reasoning of the constant 1000-m reference level for the whole Mediterranean is valid (wind forcing!?)!

Please make this sentence less generic: “In the EMed the typical post-EMT temperature and salinity inversions were found in the deep waters throughout the whole region, still indicating an increase in property distribution.”

Page 2414: Statement: “...whereas LIW is filling the intermediate depth levels with a core in the eastern part of the WMed.” is again a consequence of the “2D reasoning” in this paper!

Page 2415: Why in the WMed in contrast with the EMed “current field is more geostrophically balanced and the structures observed can be related to known sub-

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

basin scale gyres”? EMed is populated by number of sub-basin scale gyres thus this cannot explain the differences between the two sub-basins!

Page 2415: “Likely, the effects induced by the EMT are still evident in the Mediterranean Sea, and considering the time delay of many years which characterizes oceanographic processes on a basin scale, we could expect that they still will be present for some time.” Very generic statement, please be more specific or delete it!

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 10, 2399, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

