

Interactive comment on “Recent wind driven high sea ice export in the Fram Strait contributes to Arctic sea ice decline” by L. H. Smedsrud et al.

L. H. Smedsrud et al.

larsh@gfi.uib.no

Received and published: 12 August 2011

General comments from Referee #1:

This paper analyses sea ice area export through Fram strait from (i) sea ice velocity vectors obtained from Envisat SAR images, combined with concentration data to obtain area export from 2004 to 2010, and (ii) a linear correlation between ice drift velocity and geostrophic wind velocity, observed between 2004 and 2010, then used to extrapolate an ice speed time series back to 1957. The main conclusion is a positive trend on ice area export through Fram strait over the period 1957-2010, and consequently an important role of ice export on Arctic sea ice decline over the last decades. Overall, I found this paper interesting, well written and the analyses and conclusions (except some specific points listed below) rather sound. In particular, the comparison with

C843

ASMR data on figure 2 is convincing. For this reason, I recommend the publication in TC, once the points listed below are taken into account.

The two main points are:

1) The correlation between geostrophic wind and ice drift (Fig. 2), which is the backbone of the analysis, is clear, and indeed in agreement with well-known previous works (Thorndike and Colony, 1982). However, figure 2 shows also a significant variability which is not explain by the linear trend. In the manuscript, the authors simply ignore this variability, as well as its possible interpretation. As already discussed e.g. in Thorndike and Colony, this variability is not negligible, and can have various origins:

- ocean currents. The present authors implicitly assume that the oceanic forcing is strictly constant over time. This could appear reasonable, at least in first order, but this should be mentioned and discussed.

- errors on the ice velocity and on geostrophic wind velocity: how much these errors can explain the observed remaining variability?

- intrinsic stochastic variability of ice velocity. The ice velocity field can be decomposed into a “general circulation” (the component of interest here), and a stochastic component (Rampal et al., JGR, 114, C10014, 2009).

To entirely remove the impact of this stochastic component, seasonally-averaged (instead of monthly-) values should be used. - the response of sea ice to wind forcing depends on the ice state (concentration, compaction, thickness) and on the amount of internal stresses.

A weak, less concentrated and compacted ice cover will respond better to wind forcing. This ice state has hanged in recent decades, and we can expect this evolution to have significantly impacted the ice export, independently of stronger geostrophic winds. Once again, the authors do not consider this problem, as they assume a constant regression coefficient in equation (1) back to 1957. A possible way to explore this would

C844

be, over each annual cycle, from 2004 to 2010, to calculate the regression coefficient between V_{ice} and V_g , and see if it increased over time. I agree that 6 years is a quite limited dataset and so it would be probably difficult to conclude on this basis. However, this point should be at least discussed.

Answer: We certainly agree on that the variability around the linear trend should not be ignored. We shortly mentioned that we could not find a seasonal cycle of the current, but have now added a more thorough discussion of possible sources of this variability as suggested.

2) From figure 7, the authors calculate a positive trend of 4.9 ± 3.0 %. However, especially in the second part of the time series, there is apparently some autocorrelation in the signal. This will reduce the number of degrees of freedom, and therefore widen the errors bars on the trends (e.g. Wilks, *Statistical Methods in the Atmospheric Sciences*, Academic Press, 2006; Wunsch, *Discrete Inverse and State Estimation Problems*, Cambridge University Press, 2006). I'm not sure that the authors are taken into account the effect of this autocorrelation in the estimation of the error bar, and this should be done to check the robustness of the trend.

Answer: We are aware of this issue with number of degrees of freedom. We also think we have addressed this in a good way and stated this shortly here (Page 1315, line 4): "Estimation of confidence levels takes into account serial correlation in the datasets by using the effective number of observations instead of the sample size in the significance estimate (Quenouille, 1952; Sorteberg and Kvingedal, 2006). Number of independent observations was typically reduced by ~ 50 % using this procedure."

Detailed comments from Referee #1:

a) When discussing ice speed increasing within the Arctic basin (page 1313, line 25; page 1319 line 22), the reference (Rampal et al. JGR, C05013, 2009) should be also

C845

mentioned. In this paper, a trend of +9% per decade was reported for the average ice speed over the Arctic basin. It would be interesting to compare this value with that derived from the present analysis through Fram strait. For this, it would be useful to show an ice velocity time series, as deduced from the present analysis, from 1957 to 2010.

Answer :The Rampal citation has now also been added to the introduction, it was cited in the Discussion before (Page 1319). We also mention the trend in annual speed now, being 4.2% per decade. A new figure has been uploaded here showing the annual speed values. We could well include this as a new figure in the paper, but it does look very similar to the Ice area flux (Fig 7) as it is derived from the same ΔP (Eq. 1,2,3).

b) On the "Data and methods" section, it would be useful to further detail the methodology, and particularly how the uncertainties (on displacement vectors, area exports, etc..) are determined.

Answer : A separate paper is on the way dealing with more of the across strait gradients, and the shorter fluctuations. We therefore do not duplicate the details here. The title will likely be: Sea ice drift and area flux in the Fram Strait from multisensor satellite data. Authors will be: S. Sandven, F. Geyer, K. Kloster, and the Candidate journal is: Remote sensing of Environment.

c) Equation (3): I guess that units are in km^2/month

Answer : Yes - corrected.

d) Figure 1: the ice velocity data shown are out-of-phase with the annual cycle of sea ice speed within the basin, where ice drifts slower during winter when it is more compact and concentrated (Rampal et al. JGR, C05013, 2009). This difference could be mentioned, as it shows the special role of forcing (wind vs ocean) in the Fram strait region.

Answer : Nice contrast - has been added now in "3.2 Ice export variability"

C846

e) Figure 5: the linear fit between the two dataset shows a slight deviation from the diagonal. What could be the source of this bias?

Answer : A sentence on our best guess has been added - factor 3).

f) In the discussion/conclusion, it could be mentioned that: - the trend shown on figure 7 is probably a lower bound, as it is likely reinforced by a mechanical effect (looser, less concentrated ice drifts faster) which is not taken into account in the present analysis (see comment 1 above) - the trend of figure 7 is on absolute values. In relative values (normalized by the total sea ice area within the Arctic), it will be larger, thus stressing further the role of ice export on recent decline.

Answer : These two new and plausible points have also been added. The relative numbers were even given a separate paragraph. Thanks for many nice suggestions.

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 5, 1311, 2011.

C847




Fig. 1. Annual mean southward ice speed in the Fram Strait based on NCEP reanalysis pressure difference (Eq.1).

C848