

Interactive comment on “A 20-yr reanalysis Experiment in the Baltic Sea Using three Dimensional Variational (3DVAR) method” by W. Fu et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 28 June 2012

General comments

In their manuscript the authors present a multi-decadal Baltic Sea reanalysis experiment for the physical state of the Baltic Sea. For this experiment they employ a data assimilation system presented by Zhuang et al. (2011), based on the well known 3DVAR scheme. The reanalysis is then compared to independent observations to show that the results of the reanalysis improve when the data assimilation scheme is used.

The reanalysis described in the article is an interesting contribution to the field that will allow new worthwhile studies. It would, for instance, be useful to construct several Baltic Sea reanalyses with different data assimilation systems and models. This would

C621

allow for inter-comparisons between e.g. different data assimilation systems and Baltic Sea models, which might deepen understanding about their performance.

According to the paper one its goals is to assess the performance of the 3DVAR scheme in a long integration. While the comparison to nonassimilated runs is a good first step in this task, it would be beneficial in the future to also compare 3DVAR against other assimilation schemes for these kinds of applications. However, this task can be left to later studies, and I hope the authors return to these questions then.

In general the methodology in the paper seems sound, although using 3DVAR for reanalysis is harder to justify than for operational purposes. Zhuang et al. (2011) motivate the use of 3DVAR in this system among other things with its low cost of computation, but this argument should be less relevant for this paper, since for operational purposes timely delivery and resource concerns are of greater importance than for reanalysis runs.

The material is presented in a sufficiently clear manner, although both figures and language leave room for improvement.

I recommend publication after minor revisions.

Specific comments

1. The language of the article needs to be polished thoroughly. There are for example several typographical errors which could have been caught with a common spell checker. The authors might want to consider a professional proofreading.
2. I couldn't find a clear description of how 3DVAR is applied to the model. Since 3DVAR does not take the time dimension into account like 4DVAR, this means that the authors must have either assimilated each observation individually, or chosen some time window for which observations are gathered and then assimilated into the model at once. Since the first option is unlikely, I would appreciate a clearer description of this process in the article. How often is the data assimilation run? How is the choice of the

C622

time window motivated? Zhuang (2011) dealt with short operational forecasts, so one can reasonably assume that there the assimilation was applied before each run, but in this article the run is 20 years long.

3. Is this the first published multi-decadal physical state reanalysis for the Baltic Sea? If so, please state this more explicitly in the introduction, or alternatively cite previous reanalyses. Are you aware of any similar datasets?

4. The model domain apparently includes the North Sea, but results for it seem to be discarded as only Baltic Sea is presented. Why is that? Should this be discussed in the manuscript?

5. Does the model include an ice submodel? If not, then that might limit the usability of this reanalysis in further studies. If it does, then please add at least a brief discussion of it, including the effect of SST assimilation to ice results. It would be quite simple, for example, to plot total ice extent and compare whether SST assimilation affects this at all.

6. Zhuang et al. (2011) tested the validity of 3DVAR implementation with a test case with an isolated observation. Have you either then or since then for this article done other test to assure yourself that your implementation of 3DVAR is valid? Do you feel confident in the correctness of your implementation also for long integrations like this?

7. p. 1935 l. 12. eco-system -> ecosystem

8. p. 1940 l. 9. Have you tested larger magnitudes than 3 deg C and 2.5 psu? If so, what happened?

9. p. 1940 l. 15. nexse -> next

10. p. 1945 l. 16 Recommend changing mon -> month. Using the nonstandard abbreviation saves only two letters but introduces the risk of misunderstanding. You might also consider changing yr->year elsewhere in the text, where appropriate.

C623

11. p. 1958 l. 10 The Zhuang et al. (2011) reference should be updated to the OS article instead of the discussion paper.

12. Figure captions should be improved. Many captions are short and it takes time to find the information related to the figures from the text. Clearer captions would make the paper more accessible.

13. Figure 1: This figure seems to represent the domain of the model. However, the caption references a model called "DMI-BSHCmod", while the text references a model called "HIROBM-BOOS" (p. 1931, l. 4). Which one is used? This figure also does not clearly indicate the actual domain. I recommend adding coordinates of the domain boundaries to the caption and a line indicating what seems to be the boundary of the model between the North Sea and the North Atlantic at approx. 59N. Consider either adding or changing this figure to a picture of the actual model bathymetry, which is not currently depicted. Also, the nested grid described in the text is not shown anywhere. There are many things that could be improved in this figure and it would benefit from a total redrawing.

14. Figure 6: rmse->RMSE, bais->bias

15. Figure 9: rmse->RMSE, bais->bias

16. Figure 10: Caption has extra parenthesis.

17. Figure 11: Stamp maps are tiny and hard to decipher. Please consider if they could be made more readable.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 9, 1933, 2012.

C624