Ocean Sci. Discuss., 6, C10–C11, 2009 www.ocean-sci-discuss.net/6/C10/2009/ © Author(s) 2009. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



## Interactive comment on "Understanding mixing efficiency in the oceans: do the nonlinearities of the equation of state for seawater matter?" by R. Tailleux

R. Tailleux

r.g.j.tailleux@reading.ac.uk

Received and published: 11 March 2009

Michael,

I believe that saying that "energy conversions are inherently non-unique" is looking at energetics from a mathematician's viewpoint, not a physicist's viewpoint. My impression is that many colleagues will find it ok, starting from the following equations:

$$\frac{d(E_1)}{dt} = C_1$$
$$\frac{d(E_2)}{dt} = C_2$$
$$C_10$$

in which there is no conversion between the reservoirs  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  ( $C_1$  and  $C_2$  being source/sink terms for  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ ), to rewrite the equations as follows:

$$\frac{d(E_1)}{dt} = (C_1 - C_3) + C_3 = C_1^* + C_3$$
$$\frac{d(E_2)}{dt} = C_2 + C_3 - C_3 = C_2^* - C_3$$

and then say that  $C_3$  is a conversion term between  $E_1$  and  $E_2$ . If this approach were ok, then it would basically amount to say not only that energy conversions are inherently non unique, but in fact that energy conversions are completely arbitrary as well, since I can define  $C_3$  as it pleases me.

In contrast, the approach undertaken in Tailleux (2008) takes the (physical) viewpoint that in nature, the energy must flow in a specific and determined way, and that there must exist a rigorous way to look at the issue of energy conversions that eliminates the above arbitrariness. The conclusions I have reached is that in order to derive a rigorous theory of energy conversions, a number of non-standard energy reservoirs have to be introduced in the context of the fully compressible Navier-Stokes equations. As far as I can judge, my approach allows to make energy conversions well-defined and unique, and establishes that the kind of approach described above is just a mathematical game with no physical justification.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 6, 371, 2009.