

Interactive comment on “Nesting operational forecasting models in the Eastern Mediterranean: active and slave mode” by S. S. Sofianos et al.

X. Wang (Referee)

hua.wang@adfa.edu.au

Received and published: 15 August 2006

This paper uses numerical experiments to evaluate skills of the Mediterranean Forecasting models of various resolutions from basin to shelf scales. The paper is well written with a clear structure and its research topic is relevant in the context of Operational Oceanography. I would like to start the discussion of this paper by making the following comments.

1. My first concern is the justification of using ‘slave’ mode in the paper as a nesting method of downscaling the forecasting model domains. From this work, ‘slave’ mode clearly (and not surprisingly) presents problems in terms of suppressing dynamic features of finer scale/resolutions. Is this method commonly used in the MFS modelling or wider operational oceanography community? If yes, can the authors give some exam-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

ples of its use? If not, what is the justification by the authors to choose such a method as a bench mark experiment to compare with a more commonly used 'active' mode approach?

2. For the benefit of others not familiar with Mediterranean, please explain fully the terms such as 'Rhodes Gyre', 'Lerapetra, Mersa Matruh, and Shikmona anticyclones'. Several geographical locations such as Aegean Sea, Levantine, Dardanelles strait should also be noted in Fig. 1.

3. I would also like to see some comparison of forecasted flow fields by various models/experiments in addition to the predicted T/S fields.

Xiao Hua Wang, University of New South Wales Australia

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 3, 1225, 2006.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper