

Interactive comment on “Surface mass balance downscaling through elevation classes in an Earth System Model: analysis, evaluation and impacts on the simulated climate” by Raymond Sellevoid et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 25 July 2019

General synopsis This is a useful contribution about the novel application of using Earth System Models (ESM) with downscaling, via sub-gridcell elevation classes, to simulate Greenland Ice Sheet surface mass balance. Although it is fairly model-specific (based on the CESM1.0 ESM), this paper should be of broad interest to the GrIS SMB modelling and Greenland climate communities.

Some previous highly relevant literature is missing or can be better acknowledged (see comments below).

C1

I wonder whether the CESM results can be compared with MAR as well as RACMO, for an independent RCM model check (and since MAR is the main alternative RCM currently used for Greenland)?

Specific comments

Page 1, lines 15-16 re. strong Arctic warming: Please add the following reference to those cited: Overland, J.E. and Hanna, Edward and Hanssen-Bauer, I. and Kim, S.-J. and Walsh, J.E. and Wang, M. and Bhatt, U.S. and Thoman, R.L. (2018) Surface air temperature. Arctic Report Card, NOAA. <https://www.arctic.noaa.gov/Report-Card/Report-Card-2018/ArtMID/7878/ArticleID/783/Surface-Air-Temperature>

P1, L21 re. “GrIS is losing mass at an accelerated rate”: please add the following highly relevant references to those cited: Edward Hanna, Francisco J Navarro, Frank Pattyn, Catia M Domingues, Xavier Fettweis, Erik R Ivins, Robert J Nicholls, Catherine Ritz, Ben Smith, Slawek Tulaczyk, Pippa L Whitehouse, H Jay Zwally (2013) Ice sheet mass balance and climate change. Nature 498, 51-59. Bamber, JL et al. (2018): The land ice contribution to sea level during the satellite era. Environmental Research Letters, 13(6), 063008,

P2, L8: should also add there is a significant disparity between different model estimates of GrIS SMB (Fettweis 2018): Fettweis, X. (2018) The SMB Model Inter-comparison (SMBMIP) over Greenland: first rltts. AGU Fall Meeting talk archived at: <https://orbi.uliege.be/handle/2268/232923>.

P2, L19: re. statistical downscaling please add the following highly relevant references: Hanna et al. (2011) AND Wilton et al. (2017) DJ Wilton, A Jowett, E Hanna, GR Bigg, MR Van Den Broeke, X Fettweis, ... (2017) High resolution (1 km) positive degree-day modelling of Greenland ice sheet surface mass balance, 1870–2012 using reanalysis data. Journal of Glaciology 63 (237), 176-193

E Hanna, P Huybrechts, J Cappelen, K Steffen, RC Bales, E Burgess, ... (2011) Green-

C2

land ice sheet surface mass balance 1870 to 2010 based on Twentieth Century Reanalysis, and links with global climate forcing. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 116 (D24)

P2, L32: While the motivation for the study is good as stated, can you make it clear in this sentence/paragraph whether you investigated precipitation downscaling as well as temperature downscaling?

P3, L26: How was this number of elevation classes chosen? Would having a greater number of classes improve the results?

P3, L34 “Incoming radiation, precipitation and wind are kept constant across all ECs” - Is this a potential limitation of this study or could improvements be made here?

P5, L8 “snow when near-surface temperatures are between -7°C and -1°C ” – the latter value (-1°C) seems quite a low upper threshold for snow?

P10, LL4-5 “the first time the EC method for downscaling from a global climate model of ~ 100 km to the much higher resolution (5 km) of an ice sheet model” – point out that this kind and magnitude of statistical downscaling has been previously successfully used in downscaling meteorological reanalysis data from ~ 100 -km resolution to 5-km resolution (Hanna et al. 2005 & 2011, Wilton et al. 2017). E Hanna, P Huybrechts, I Janssens, J Cappelen, K Steffen, A Stephens (2005) Runoff and mass balance of the Greenland ice sheet: 1958–2003. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres* 110 (D13) (Other two references details are above.)

P11, LL9-11: The recommended implementation of a precipitation phase downscaling scheme doesn't really solve the great challenge of overall elevation correction for precipitation. This paragraph therefore sounds a little weak as currently stated – can the authors strengthen their argument here?

P12, L4 “Our sensitivity experiments reveal that a larger lapse rate for the temperature correction results in higher melt energy gradients” – isn't this rather an obvious and

C3

unsurprising result? – perhaps rephrase?

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2019-122>, 2019.

C4