

Interactive comment on “Results of the third Marine Ice Sheet Model Intercomparison Project (MISMIP+)” by Stephen L. Cornford et al.

Fuyuki SAITO (Referee)

saitofuyuki@jamstec.go.jp

Received and published: 21 February 2020

This paper present the results of MISMIP+, a new model intercomparison of marine ice sheet models. I think this paper is fairly well written with some exception below, and can be accepted with minor revision.

L23 to L38: MISMIP+ is the first experiment among MISMIP series, which changes the mass balance. I think this should be emphasized.

Figure 1. Remark at top or bottom as $t=0$ may help. The vertical directions show a schematic view of ice volume (bigger ice sheet towards upper), which can be mentioned. The subexperiment names (Ice1r, Ice1rr, Ice1ra etc) should be mentioned in the figure.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Eq (1) and Table 1. I try to draw the bedrock map using the equation and values in the table, but I cannot reproduce the figure. I suspect the signs of B_n are all opposite. If that is correct, elevation around (0,-40) is higher than +300m, which is not clear using the present contours.

L46 in Asay-Davis et al. (2016).

L56. Need to include somewhere around here that the x-direction is toward the flow while the y is across, or at least refer Figure 2.

Eqs.(4) (5): α is not defined.

Eq.(7) confusing. \max is outside \tanh , but not clear.

L145. It is not clear whether m_2 is applied only at the base of ice shelf or not. It matters for the regions close to the lateral walls.

Figure 3. Horizontal labels are missing. $x(\text{km})$ and $t(\text{yr})$?

Figures 4 and 11 top left. $\text{Ice1r}(t=0)$ and $\text{Ice2r}(t=0)$ is identical by definition, which may be better to mention.

L313 less than 10km. But, this value is correct? It looks around 20km spread for yellow lines.

SAITO Fuyuki.

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2019-326>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

