

Interactive  
Comment

# ***Interactive comment on “Parameterization of atmosphere–surface exchange of CO<sub>2</sub> over sea ice” by L. L. Sørensen et al.***

**N. Steiner (Referee)**

Nadja.Steiner@ec.gc.ca

Received and published: 10 September 2013

## General comments

The paper “Parameterization of atmosphere-surface exchange of CO<sub>2</sub> over sea-ice” discusses a new application for parameterizing CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes over sea-ice. The paper addresses a potentially important and for the longest time ignored process of CO<sub>2</sub> exchange. Hardly any work has been done with respect to parameterizing this process and it is hence, a very timely study. The paper is generally well written and the methods described accurately. However, it seems to me that for the fact that the main content is to evaluate a parameterization based on resistance analogy as used over terrestrial surfaces, the actual analysis and discussion of the parameterization/comparison to measurements is rather short and unclear. I suggest that this component should

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



be expanded to make clear how well the parametrization does perform and how large are the errors. This could then be tied in with the discussion/mention of the need for accurate estimations of surface pCO<sub>2</sub>. The result should then also be mentioned in the conclusions.

Specific comments

Page 3902

Line 16 specify which TCO<sub>2</sub> ( from the ocean, ice?)

Page 3903

This is to our knowledge...first attempt to parameterize air-sea-ice fluxes of CO<sub>2</sub>

I think this sentence should be modified to include something like “via resistance theory” or similar, ... Line 12

While it is correct that sea-ice does not change in response to wind as water does it is not immune. Maybe a note could be added that sea-ice surface might change via ice deformation, but on much longer timescales and is therefore not included in the study.

Page 3907/8

Equation 9 I am not sure what the sign convention is here, but from signage in equation 4 and 8, I would expect a minus sign on the right side of equation 9

similarly, I would expect equation 12 to contain -Ra-Rb rather than -Ra +Rb

Please check, maybe an additional step in the equation conversions would help?

Page 3010 Line 1-2 It is not clear if “showed good agreement” refers to the current study or the earlier Sorenson and Larsen Study, please clarify

Line 5-7 could this be further analyzed?

Page 3916 6-9, this sentence is somewhat confusing. This conclusion can probably be

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



expanded for clarification. See also general comment.

Technical corrections

Page 3901

line 17 sea-ice, which have => sea-ice which has .. line 19 remove both ( there are three...) line 26 reduced ice cover is expected to increase uptake=> temporarily increase uptake (???)

Page 3902

Line7 studies regarding => studies discussing (?) Line 11 across sea-ice => through sea-ice that the sea-ice => that sea-ice Line 27 more knowledge => better knowledge

Page 3914 Line 12: Clarify is this an increased surface flux into the ice?

Page 3903

Line 4-7 Reformulate in two sentences, maybe separate with “In addition “ in lieu of the “and”...

Page 3905

Page 25 physically => physical

Page 3914 Line 2 proper => properly Line 8 even can => can even Line 9 due to increase of difference in => due to an increase in the difference between Line 13 well to the => well with the Line 24 surface possibly => surface, possibly

---

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 7, 3899, 2013.

TCD

7, C1698–C1700, 2013

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

