

Interactive comment on “Results of the Marine Ice Sheet Model Intercomparison Project, MISMIP” by F. Pattyn et al.

J. Fastook (Referee)

fastook@maine.edu

Received and published: 31 January 2012

General Comments:

I am very pleased to see this sort of paper produced and presented. Model intercomparisons are extremely valuable both for the modelling community as well as for those trying to understand what modellers are doing. These sorts of presentations go a long way in exposing the strengths and limitations of the various approaches. I appreciate that the authors point out that the approximation-free Full-Stokes solution may not be much better than many of the much more computationally efficient approximate methods because of fundamental uncertainties in the specification of material properties that produce a larger error than the approximate methods do.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



The authors have provided a clear and well-defined set of extremely simple benchmarks as targets for various models with completely different physics and implementation methods. They do an admirable job of categorizing them, based on both the level of physics and the assumptions made. I would perhaps have been interested in mention of the numerical methods used, but I am sure those are spelled out in detail in the referenced papers describing each model.

The authors' conclusions appear robust and are clearly presented. I have no quibbles with this paper and would be happy to see it published as is.

Specific Comments:

Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of TC? Yes Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes, novel results Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? YES Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? It would be difficult without access to all of the contributing modellers. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes Is the language fluent and precise? Yes Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Yes Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? I saw no supplementary material.

Technical Comments:

a minor typo: pg 289, lines 23-26:

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

“Implementation of grounding-line migration requires to resolve the transition zone at sufficient high resolution, either by using a moving-grid approach (following the grounding line directly) or by sufficient fine sub-sampling around the grounding line.”

Replace “to resolve” with “resolving”

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.the-cryosphere-discuss.net/6/C18/2012/tcd-6-C18-2012-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 6, 267, 2012.

TCD

6, C18–C20, 2012

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

