The Cryosphere
Discussions

Open Access

Interactive comment on "Modelled present and future thaw lake area expansion/contraction trends throughout the continuous permafrost zone" by Y. Mi et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 9 October 2014

Modelled present and future thaw lake area expansion/contraction trends throughout the continuous permafrost zone. Mi et al.,

The paper by Mi et al., titled "Modelled present and future thaw area expansion/contraction trends throughout the continuous permafrost zone" applies a stochastic modelling approach to explore trends in the growth and drainage of thermokarst lakes. The topic is of broad relevance and the modelling provides a method to explore the landscape evolution of lake-rich permafrost environments. Modelling thaw lake evolution at a broad-scale is novel and has potential to advance scientific understanding of the impacts of permafrost thaw on Arctic landscapes and feedbacks associated with carbon flux.

The paper requires significant editorial attention and lacks sufficient background information to warrant publication in its current form. The scientific quality of the paper requires attention prior to publication.In my view there are several model limitations that are not adequately discussed in the manuscript. It is important to rigorously address these to help readers understand the applicability and limitations of this study.

In my view, the mechanics of the model are not sufficiently explained here. Given that the modelling approach is relatively new I would like the Authors to provide a more rigorous account of how the model works rather than directing readers to another publication. This would allow for some review discussion on the physical basis for the model, whether modelling assumptions reflect conditions which exist in the natural environment (at the field study sites), or whether the relevant controls that can explain the behavior of thaw lakes in different geographical environments are accounted for in this approach.

The Authors chose to model thaw lake processes for different Arctic sites. I find it problematic that there is very little information provided on the physical environments that characterize these different sites other than mean ice content and climate. Landscape factors such as topography, surficial geology, ground temperatures, spatial variation in ice content, would seem to be fundamental controls on the rates and nature of thaw lake processes. It is not clear how these are integrated into the model. The paper would benefit greatly from a section on model limitations. This is very important because as written the study purports to "reproduce recent thaw lake dynamics on four representative Arctic sites". It is not clear that the paper does this.

Validation of the results also requires some clarification. The Authors select four sites for their modelling, and results are rationalized as being realistic because they fall within the (very large) range of empirical observations made in studies from across the circumpolar North. To make such an assertion given that the Authors have chosen to simulate particular areas but cite a broad range of field based observations as a validation of the model results is rather tenuous. I recommend major revision prior to

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

publication. I have provided several recommendations for the Authors to consider when revising their manuscript.

Abstract The abstract requires editorial attention. Several statements made in this section require further development. Critical context that summarizes the processes of thaw lake development and physical controls on these processes should be at least mentioned here. It would be useful to explain some of the geomorphic, geological and hydrological factors that contribute to variation in lake response to permafrost warming/thaw. P3604 L4: Clarify why a drained lake basin is a carbon sink due to "sedimentation". Are the Authors referring to processes related to organic accumulation and permafrost aggradation?

P3604 L5-8: Editorial modification required.

P3604 L10: Editorial modification – change "increases" to "increase"

P3604 L17-20: The sentences here require editorial attention. How do the Authors know they have reproduced recent thaw lake dynamics at the four study sites? Is there any field evidence provided to support this? It is somewhat misleading to state that the simulations are comparable with data. This implies that the modelling was validated by field data from the sites, however I believe that the Authors are referring to rates of change from empirical studies from around the circumpolar north which show that lake responses have been variable. The field data in fact indicates significant regional variability that is likely driven in part by differences in permafrost, surficial geology, topography and other environmental variables. The last sentence requires additional words of clarification.

P3605 L17: add and "s" on "system"

P3605 L18: "permafrost will aggrade" is more appropriate

P3605: Geology, topography and permafrost conditions (ice and temperature) control thaw lake processes. The Authors should show some appreciation for this in the

background section.

P3606 L11: Are the modelling results validated by field observation or remote sensing data from the study sites? If this is the case it should be stated here.

P3605 L29: See Marsh et al., 2009 for process oriented perspective on lake drainage.

Pg 3606 L2: The process that will dominate are likely related to landscape context and will vary from one region to another.

2 Methods The basics of the modeling approach should be elaborated upon in the Methods section.

P 3606 Why does the model assume linear relations between lake expansion and climate? Some rationale or clarification behind this statement would be useful because one should assume that due to latent heat effects and phase change that relations between climate warming and permafrost thaw would not be linear. It would be useful to explain what a linear relation between thaw lake expansion and ice content means.

P3606 Is the modeled data compared with field observation? If it is, the method of comparison between model performance and reality must be explained.

P3607 L3: spelling correction - "introduced"

P3607: Clarify what this means – "Stochastic processes in the model are introduced in the selection of ice-rich grid cells where new lakes are created, and the incidence of lake drainage, ….". Is this process related in any way to the distribution of ground ice over the modeled surface? Based on the description of factors contributing to lake drainage (distance of lake shore to drainage system and precipitation) the Authors should clearly explain how lakes drain in the natural environment. What is the rationale/physical basis, with supporting references that justify the model assumptions?

2.2 Simulation set up

If the simulations aim to reproduce region specific conditions, then appropriate discus-

sion on physical, permafrost, climate, hydrological conditions in those regions should be provided. In this case the reader is not provided with necessary background that describes the modeled environments. This seems critical because it is well known that physical characteristics of permafrost terrrain influence the nature and trajectory of landscape response to disturbance or climate perturbation.

Clarify how the model treats spatial distribution of ground ice across the landscape? Clarify how topography is treated in the model? It would seem that topographic relief would have an important influence on the rates of lake expansion. Are all of these regions characterized by similar topography?

What are the surficial deposits in the respective study regions?

Figure 1 is not particularly clear. Presentation of some metrics for lake size and density and drainage systems for the respective areas would be good context for later interpreting the modelling results.

P3609 L6-12: There are environments where data can be extracted from historical air photos on rates of lake enlargement and on drainage rates. It would seem prudent to test the model against some sort of comparable data derived from either historical airphotos or remote sensing imagery for the study area.

What was the magnitude of change found by Labrecque et al 2009?

P3609 L13-27: The contrasting response of thermokarst lake expansion and drainage in the cited literature very likely reflects the importance of landscape context (nature and ice content of permafrost, ground temperatures, surficial materials, physiography etc.). How does the modelling approach deal with these controls on lake expansion or drainage? This should be considered when explaining the modelled results.

P3609 L25: Spelling "observations"

P3610 L9: What drives the differences in simulation results between the respective environments?

4. Discussion

P3610 L22 to P3611 L3: This section requires reworking due to several issues of writing. For example, I don't think that "contract" is an appropriate verb to describe a decrease in thaw lake size. The word model is used 3 times in one sentence. P3611 L1 – This line implies that model performance was evaluated, which I don't believe it has been. While the model used a realistic lake and fluvial system configuration, it is difficult to understand how other landscape factors are integrated into the simulations. The Authors must seriously consider how the modeling results are informing us about the respective behavior of the respective environments.

P3611 L10: Remove the word "depth". The sentence should read "and the thickening of the active layer, the, .." The process being described here is unclear and required better explanation and citation of field based literature. I assume the Authors are referring to water flow through a thickening active layer which may result in drainage. There are also documented examples of lakes disappearing due to subsurface conduits resulting in drainage of lakes to the groundwater system. Again, the specific processes that operate in a particular area will vary as a function of lake morphology, ground temperatures, permafrost thickness and surficial geology.

P3611 L21: Sentence requires editorial attention.

P3611 L21 to P3612 L2: A more rigorous discussion about why the different climate scenarios produce such different results would be useful here. For example, why does the model not perform realistically as the Authors suggest when the MIROC simulation is applied. The discussion that links modeled results to mechanisms of change is quite weak in this section.

Clarify in the figure captions how to distinguish modelled results from the two emission scenarios.

Conclusions: Authors state that the model captures realistic thaw lake growth and

drainage cycles, but published literature indicates a wide range of variability between studies. This is most likely attributed to inherent landscape factors which characterize different regions and influence processes of thaw lake expansion and drainage. New knowledge that will assist in understanding landscape responses at intermediate scales presumably requires the factors that influence processes of thaw lake expansion and drainage to be integrated into the model. This seems to be an important limitation of the model which isn't adequately addressed by the Authors in current version of the manuscript.

_____

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 8, 3603, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper