Response to Reviewer #2's comments

General comments

1) *My main concern is that the way the authors word their conclusions and their title suggests they provided model estimates of the diurnal variations in the snow and vapor isotopes. In fact, presented simulations are driven by average diurnal cycles of the meteorological parameters. Thus, instead, the authors provide the impact of an average day on initialized snow and vapor isotopes. The presented current results show how a given initial surface snow and vapor isotopic composition could develop within the first 24 hours when applying water vapor exchange.*

It is unclear to me why the authors didn't run the simulation based on the meteorological input of individual days instead of stacking and averaging the input data. This limits the simulation time to only 24 hours. Such a short time does not allow for the development of the snow surface over several days. I would consider a minimum of a week spinup time to perform a model simulation in a more equilibrated state as could be expected in nature.

The intuitive approach to obtain an estimate of the average diurnal impact on the isotopes would be to run a longer simulation over several days and give the average daily impact. It seems to me that the authors have the needed data and tools to provide a model simulation over several days, as suggested above. This will improve the manuscript's relevance and provide better applicability of their results to explain observed changes in the snow isotopic composition.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer's insightful comments. In the original manuscript, we chose to use the mean stacked conditions to conduct simulation since we wanted to highlight the effects of air-snow exchange in a general case. But in order to avoid confusion, in the revised manuscript, the simulations were conducted using continuous meteorological input for each individual day during the studied period at Dome C, where the model was run during the entire studied period (Jan 5th to Jan 16th, 2015), and the simulated results were stacked and averaged to evaluate the changes in snow and water vapor isotopes within a 24-hour period, as shown in Figure 3 of the revised manuscript. The model performance in water vapor isotopic variations is better than the simulations in the original manuscript. For snow isotopic composition, the diurnal evolution of simulated results can basically match with observations in the order of magnitude during a typical frost event (Figure 2 in this response).

In the Dome A simulations, however, the selected days for clear-sky, cloudy, and winter conditions were not continuous, making it difficult to conduct simulations as was done for Dome C. Instead, we were only able to use the model for one day to simulate the diurnal changes in snow and water vapor isotopes, after a week of spin-up time. This allows to evaluate the effects of air-snow exchange under representative meteorological conditions. It is important to note that the input meteorological conditions and latent heat flux during both the spin-up time and the simulated period at Dome A were obtained from stacking observations or calculations on selected days, due to the non-continuous clear-sky and cloudy days in the studied period. Furthermore, the choice of the modeling running day and duration can significantly influence the final results of snow and water vapor isotopic composition, as meteorological conditions and latent heat flux vary significantly between two different days within a season. To mitigate this effect, it is recommended to use the averaged meteorological conditions to run simulations at Dome A. These approaches at least provide some, on average, quantitative information on the isotopic effects of atmospheric-snow water vapor exchanges at Dome A.



Figure 1. Schematic diagram of the box model used in this study (Revised version).

2) *Secondly, there are errors in the calculation of the latent heat flux as well as the calculation of the isotopic flux. Please see the details below. In addition, to my understanding, the latent heat flux is calculated based on already stacked and averaged meteorological data. Since the latent heat flux is non-linearly dependent on these meteorological parameters, the resulting flux based on the averages can diverge severely from a diurnal average of the latent heat flux resulting from hourly calculations. The presented simulations need to be re-run using the corrected latent heat flux calculation.*

Response: We would like to express our gratitude to the reviewer for bringing to our attention the errors in the calculations of latent heat flux and isotope flux. We have taken into account the detailed comments provided in this response and have made the necessary corrections to the equations for these parameters in the revised manuscript.

As part of our revisions, we have also changed the calculation method for the latent heat flux and isotope flux for Dome C. Instead of using stacked and averaged meteorological data within 24 hours, we now use continuous meteorological input for individual days over the studied period. For the Dome A simulations, the latent heat flux calculations remain the same as the Dome C simulation cases. However, the isotope flux was obtained by stacked and averaged latent heat flux data due to the selection of cloud conditions (Comment #1). These changes in the calculation method can provide more accurate changes in the flux parameters on a diurnal scale. Furthermore, the uncertainties of these parameters can be easily estimated by calculating the standard deviation of the simulated results on the given days. More details on this can be found in Comment #52 of this response.

3) *Another concern is that even when the above-mentioned errors in the latent heat flux calculation are corrected, the conditions for the Monin-Obukov similarity theory (MOST) are often violated under polar conditions. The present study does not discuss the quality of the calculated latent heat flux. If the authors pursue the goal of providing as realistic estimates of the water vapor exchange on the isotopes as possible, they have to make sure that the quality of the driving parameter, the latent heat flux, is well evaluated for similar conditions.*

Response: Thanks the reviewer for this comments. Indeed, the eddy covariance (EC) technique is a more robust method for quantifying latent heat fluxes and calculating isotopic fluxes at the atmosphere-snow interface, as demonstrated by Whal et al. (2021). However, this technique heavily relies on specialized measurement instruments, making it difficult to determine the latent heat flux in the absence of such instruments. As a result, high-quality latent heat flux data is not available at most polar sites.

Alternatively, the Monin-Obukhov similarity theory (MOST) are widely applied in polar regions because it calculates the latent heat flux based solely on meteorological parameters. While it seems not to be very suitable under polar conditions especially in winter, some previous studies have used the bulk method and MOST to calculate surface fluxes and the results were reasonable. For example, the King and Anderson (1994) study indicated that MOST can well describe the winter heat and water vapor fluxes at the Halley station of the Brunt Ice Shelf. Van den Broeke et al. (2005) calculated the year-round turbulent fluxes with MOST along a traverse line from coastal to inland region in Dronning Maud Land, Antarctica. Based on these, we think it is acceptable to use MOST and the bulk method if we intend to predict the potential mass and isotope changes that can be caused by atmosphere-snow vapor exchange.

When it comes to the quality of model calculations, the key factor is whether the model has been built using appropriate physical processes and meteorological parameters. If such a model can accurately reproduce observations at Dome C, it is highly likely that it will also be able to make predictions for Dome A within some degree of uncertainty. We hope we can have more observational data from Dome A to constrain the model, which is on progress but not available currently.

Detailed comments

1) *L20-22: This is misleading because the given values refer to the simulated changes when applying one average summer day. The way it is currently written suggests that the given values correspond to the average daily impact on the isotopes when simulating many different summer days.*

Response: Thank you for bringing the misleading information to our attention. We have revised the manuscript by re-simulating the continuous variations for snow isotopes and water vapor isotopes at the atmosphere-snow interface. Using the new simulated results obtained from Dome C and Dome A, we have calculated the daily impact of atmosphere-snow water vapor exchange on water isotopes. This was done by averaging the hourly values during summer clear-sky, cloudy and winter days. Based on these new results, we have rewritten the Abstract to reflect our findings accurately.

2) *L26: I disagree with this statement. Although, in contrast to summer, the meteorological variables don't seem to have a diurnal cycle in winter, the simulation of the isotopic changes shows similar magnitudes to the simulated changes in summer. How do you come to the conclusion that there are no relevant isotopic changes simulated on a diurnal scale in winter? Please clarify what this statement refers to. In that context, please reconsider the use of the term "diurnal cycle" or "diurnal pattern" in the manuscript. For me, a diurnal cycle is a repetitive pattern, i.e., similar values are found at the same time of the day. However, the authors use that term when describing the simulated isotopic change within 24 hours (e.g., L26, L295, L296, L310, L314, L319, L328, L330, L335, L339, L353-355, L361, L403,. . .). But since the simulated isotopic values are different at 00:00 and 24:00 of the simulated day, the isotopes do not show a diurnal cycle but a change during one day.*

Response: Thanks for pointing out this. Our simulations at Dome A indicate that the water vapor isotopic composition during winter exhibits similar magnitudes of change to those observed during summer. However, the variations in snow isotopic composition during winter are significantly smaller than those observed during summer. This difference can be attributed to the more pronounced changes in meteorological conditions and latent heat flux that occur within a 24-hour period during summer days. As a result, we have revised the Abstract to emphasize the significance of meteorological conditions on the impact of atmosphere-snow water vapor exchange. Additionally, we have rephrased the sentences in L26 to provide a more explicit statement in the revised manuscript.

"*According to the model simulations, atmosphere-snow vapor exchange can result in little to no changes water vapor and surface snow water isotopes under winter conditions at Dome A. However, the model predicts that snow $\delta^{18}O$ and δD would be depleted there will be more depletion in snow $\delta^{18}O$ and δD during the 24-hour simulation period in winter, which is opposite to the predictions made under summer conditions.*"

We also appreciate the feedback regarding the misnomer and have thus replaced the term "diurnal cycle" or "diurnal pattern" with the more accurate term "diurnal changes" or "diurnal variations" in the revised manuscript.

3) *L114-116: This sentence lacks clarity, please reformulate it. The calculation of sublimation and deposition is based on the same formula in the model, so why are two different formulations used here? And please change "followed by a mixing procedure and then uptake of surface snow", e.g., to "and the deposit is mixed into the snow surface layer".*

Response: Thank you for your comment. Previous studies have shown that there are differences in isotopic fractionation between sublimation and deposition (Ritter et al., 2016; Hughes et al., 2021). It is important to note that during deposition, the dominant process is equilibrium fractionation, whereas sublimation is significantly influenced by kinetic fractionation, except for equilibrium fractionation. Therefore, it is necessary to use two different formulations to describe the isotopic balance between snow and water vapor in Section 2.2. In case of mass changes in sublimation and deposition, the same formula as shown in Eq: (1) can be used.

However, we agree that the statement mentioned in the comment was confusing, and we have rewritten it in the revised manuscript as follows:

"During sublimation, water vapor is released from snow, transported into the atmospheric layer via turbulent mixing and molecular diffusion, and immediately mixed with the water vapor already in the near-surface atmospheric layer. During deposition, water vapor is influenced by aerodynamic resistance from turbulence and molecular diffusion, and the deposit is mixed into the snow surface layer."

4) *L124: What does "mainly" and "etc" refer to? Are further input parameters required to run the model? If so, please provide a complete list of all input parameters. If not, please remove the "etc".*

Response #4: Remove, Thanks.

5) *L129-130: Please provide a sufficient discussion of the uncertainty of the calculated latent heat fluxes beyond what is presented in S2 in the supplements. Is there a way to evaluate the quality of the latent heat flux calculations using another dataset (e.g., measured with an eddy covariance system)?*

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have made significant updates to the revised manuscript, particularly regarding the estimation method for the uncertainty of the latent heat flux calculations. The original Monte Carlo method has been replaced with a more straightforward approach that involves stacked and averaged simulations over multiple days. This new method relies on continuous calculations for the latent heat flux using meteorological input data from individual days. We have provided a detailed explanation of this new method in the Text S2 of the supplements (details can be seen in Comment #52), where we also analyze the impact of the uncertainty of the calculated latent heat fluxes.

It is crucial to assess the accuracy of the latent heat flux calculations. However, there were no available measurements from the eddy covariance system to validate the calculations at Dome A. Therefore, we had to rely on comparing our calculations with those in previous publications. Ma Y. et al. (2011) had previously estimated the latent heat flux at this site. According to their findings, the latent heat flux calculations exhibited significant cycles on the diurnal scale and its diurnal ranges are 2.7 W/M^2 during summertime. These features and the order of magnitude for latent heat flux are consistent with the calculations in our study. Moreover, both the previous studies and our study found that the diurnal changes in latent heat flux are not significant during winter days. Based on these similarities, we are confident that the latent heat flux calculations in our study are reliable.

6) *L134, Eq 1.: The formula that the authors use to calculate the latent heat flux is not correct. Following Berkowicz and Prahm (1982) (B&P82) from solving Eq. 22 for LE, then using H from Eq. 11d with u and Θ∗ from Eqs. 11a and 11b,* $\Delta u = u_{air} - u_{surface}$ *with* $u_{surface} = 0$*, and* $\gamma = cp/Ls$ *you obtain:*

$$LE = \rho L_s \kappa^2 \cdot \frac{u_{air}}{log\left(\frac{z_{u,a}}{z_{u,0}}\right) - \Psi_m\left(\frac{z_{u,2}}{L}\right) + \Psi_m\left(\frac{z_{u,1}}{L}\right)} \cdot \frac{q_a - q_s}{R \cdot log\left(\frac{z_{t,a}}{z_{t,0}}\right) - \Psi_h\left(\frac{z_{t,2}}{L}\right) + \Psi_h\left(\frac{z_{t,1}}{L}\right)} \quad (1)$$

Additionally, Ls should not show up on the right side of the formula when giving the expression for LE/Ls. Please correct the theory of the box model calculation and re-run all simulations of the study. Furthermore, in Eq. 1, in L134 and L138: There is no time derivative given in B&P82, they use Δ to indicate the vertical gradient. When using the MOST, the latent heat flux depends on the wind speed as well as the vertical humidity gradient (qa-qs).

Response: We are grateful to the reviewer for this valuable suggestion. Based on this feedback, we have made necessary corrections to Eq: (1) in the revised manuscript. However, for simplification of calculation, we ignored the corrected parameters in Eq: (1) during modeling. Using the revised model, we generated new simulations and the updated results are presented in Figures 2-6 of the main text (at the end of this response).

7) *L135: Please change "ρ_V" to "ρ_a".*

Response: Thanks, correct.

8) *L145: Where does the chosen value of 0.244 mm for the roughness length come from? The latent heat flux is highly sensitive to the choice of the roughness length. Please provide a sensitivity analysis of the simulated results to the choice of a range of roughness lengths, e.g., 0.1 mm to 2 mm.*

Response: The roughness length (z_0) at Dome A was calculated in this study using the least square method and wind observations at three levels (1 m, 2 m, and 4 m) under neutral conditions, which typically vary between 10^{-5} to 10^{-3} m. To simplify the calculations, a constant value of z_0 = 2.44 ×10^{-4} m was used in the modeling. This estimate was determined using all wind speed data (397 groups) under neutral conditions. It is worth noting that z_0 in this study is close to the previous calculation of 1.45×10^{-4} m from Ma et al., (2011).

We acknowledge the importance of z_0 value in obtaining accurate results. In response to the reviewer's suggestion, we have added a sensitivity test for z_0 in the supplementary section (Text S3). Additionally, we have provided detailed explanations and cautions for z_0 calculations in the main text.

The added text S3 is shown as follows:

"Besides the initial parameters, changes in z_0 and snow density might influence the isotopic effects of atmosphere-snow water vapor exchange. Thus, we conducted two other groups of comparative experiments the sensitivity test and run for a 24-h period under summer clear-sky conditions at Dome A. The first was focused on the sensitivity of surface and water vapor $\delta^{18}O$ to varying z_0 between 0.1 to 2 mm. The second experiment aimed to investigate the isotopic effects of snow-air vapor exchange in response to different snow density (300-400 kg/m^3). All other simulation settings were the same as in Section 2.2.4 of the main text.

The results of sensitivity tests for z_0 and snow density are shown in Fig. S1. As shown in the figure, the magnitude of the diurnal variations in water vapor $\delta^{18}O$ ($\delta^{18}O_v$)

is very sensitive to z_0 but not to snow density (Fig. S1) given that z0 determines the calculations of latent heat flux. This is consistent with Ritter et al. (2016) who pointed out that diurnal variations in water vapor isotopic composition decrease with the increase of mixing layer height. In contrast, the magnitude of diurnal variations in snow $\delta^{18}O$ ($\delta^{18}O_s$) is more sensitive to snow density (Fig. S1).

9) *L172: Above (in L138), RH_i is defined as the relative humidity over ice, not for the specific humidity.*
Response: Thanks, correct.

10) *L182, L183: The "h" in Merlivat and Jouzel (1979) (M&J79) does not refer to the relative humidity of the air, but to the relative humidity of the air with respect to the surface temperature, i.e., h =qair qsat,surface (instead of RHair =qair qsat,air). The formulation in M&J79 is really confusing, but their qs in the formula of h =q/qs (below Eq. 9 in M&J79), in fact, refers to the "saturated specific humidity at the air-water interface (z=0)", i.e., the saturation specific humidity with respect to the surface temperature, while q is the air specific humidity. It is, thus, not correct to use the relative humidity here, but instead h =qair qs,surface. If this was not the case in the simulations, please correct and re-run them. Otherwise, please be more precise in the description of RH_i.*
Response: Thanks for the valuable feedback provided by the reviewer regarding the term 'humidity'. We have carefully reviewed our equations and made the necessary corrections based on the definition provided in Merlivat and Jouzel (1979). The revised equations have been used to generate new simulated results. Furthermore, we have improved the clarity of the description of RH_i in the supplementary material. For more information on the corrections made, please kindly refer to our response to Comment # 51.

11) *L450 and 454. The authors state that the air temperature is controlling the isotopic fraction. This is not correct. It is the snow surface temperature, which is governing the isotopic fractionation. L189: Where does the expression for Rt EX come from? Because Eq. 2 in Jouzel and Merlivat (1984) is RtEX =af (Rtv + 1) − 1. Please correct this*
Response: Thanks for pointing out these mistakes. The necessary corrections have been done in the revised manuscript, including revising the Eq: (13) and updating L450 and L454.

$$R_{Ex}^{t} = \alpha_f (R_v^t + 1) - 1 \qquad (13)$$

12) *L200-201: Casado et al. (2016) does not present a snow dataset. If the authors refer to the Touzeau et al. (2016) dataset, please add the reference.*
Response: Thanks, we have added the reference.

13) *L209: I suggest replacing "representative" with "average". It was initially unclear to me what the authors meant by "stacking" the observed cycles.*

Response: We agree. The “representative” has been replaced by “average” in the revised manuscript.

14) *L210: Please remove the “e.g.” and “etc.” in the parenthesis since the given parameters are the only ones that can be downloaded from the CALVA program.*
Response: Thanks, delete.

15) *L211-216: Is there no surface temperature record available for DOME-C? And if not, why is the surface temperature calculated from ERA-5 model long wave data instead of using the ERA-5 model output of the surface temperature?*
Response: During the modelled period, surface temperature data were available for Dome C, as measured by a Campbell Scientific IR120 infrared probe and reported by Casado et al. (2016). In the revised manuscript, we used these observations as input for simulations at Dome C instead of the calculations based on the method from Brun et al. (2011).

However, for Dome A, surface temperature observations were not available from 2005 to 2011. Therefore, we used the method from Brun et al. (2011) to calculate surface temperature (Eq: (17) in the main text). We chose this method because it can accurately represent the observations at Dome C. To validate the calculations at Dome A, we compared them with observed 10cm firn temperature at the same location. The calculations matched well with the observed snow temperature for the top 10cm layer, as shown in Figure 2a.

$$Ts = \left(\frac{LW_{up}+(\epsilon-1)LW_{dn}}{\epsilon\sigma}\right)^{0.25} \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, the direct output of surface temperature from the ERA-5 model can also be used as input for our model because the ERA-5 model output at Dome C is comparable to the surface temperature calculations based on the method used in this study, as well as the long-wave radiation data from the ERA-5 reanalysis data (Figure 2b).



Figure 2. The comparison of the T_s results of different methods. (a) The calculated T_s and the observed snow temperature for top 10 cm snow at Dome A, during the period of 2005-2011 (b) The calculated T_s, the ERA-5 model output of T_s and the observed T_s at Dome C, during the period of 5th-16th January, 2015

16) *L214: An emissivity of 0.93 seems relatively low to me. Please indicate where this value originates from.*

Response: Thanks for this comment. The value of 0.93 for snow emissivity was cited from the Doctoral thesis of Ma et al. (2012), which calculated the surface snow temperature at Dome A. This value is lower than the snow emissivity of 0.99 at Dome C (Brun et al., 2011; Vignon et al., 2017). Despite the significant difference between these two values, we still use the value of 0.93 as the snow emissivity for Dome A simulations. We have now included this difference between Dome A and Dome C in the revised Table S1.

17) *L216-217: The latent heat flux is calculated based on the averaged meteorological parameters. In my view, it makes more sense to calculate the latent heat flux based on the hourly data and (if needed) stack and average it afterward.*

Response: We concur that the fluctuations in latent heat flux over a period of multiple days are significant for subsequent simulations related to water isotopes. To that end, we recalculated the latent heat flux and then computed the average, which is illustrated in Figure 2 of the primary text (please see the revised version at the end of this response).

18) *L217: Please remove the "etc." if no further data is used.*

Response: Thanks, remove.

19) *L220: An average snow density from 2m+ deep snow pits might not be appropriate for the top 1.5 cm. Please provide a sensitivity analysis of the simulation using a range of realistic surface snow densities.*

Response: Thanks for the suggestion. We will test the isotopic values in response to varying snow density at Dome A and add results to supplementary (Text S3).

20) *L234: What does "to fully assess the accumulated isotope effects of atmosphere-snow water vapor exchange." mean? Please rewrite this sentence to clarify on this.*

Response: In order to illustrate the impact of cloud presence on the simulation results at Dome A, we have conducted two simulated cases: one with cloud and one without cloud. However, we understand that the original sentence in L234 may have been unclear. Therefore, we have completely rewritten the sentence as follows:

"Therefore, in the model simulations for Dome A, we simulated two representative cases with and without cloud (i.e., cloudy vs. clear-sky conditions) in order to accurately assess the isotopic variations associated with atmosphere-snow water vapor exchange."

21) *L250-251: I hardly see any diurnal cycle in the wind speed. In addition, I would argue that the diurnal cycle of the LE differs from the diurnal cycles of Ts and q, since it has a local minimum at 07:00UTC.*

Response: Thanks for providing a different perspective, as suggested by the reviewer. The wind has a diurnal cycle under clear-sky conditions at Dome A. However, due to the large range of the y-axis in Figure 2a of main text, the significant pattern for wind was unclear. We have made necessary corrections to Figure 2 of main text to improve its clarity.

Regarding LE, we recalculated it following the reviewer's suggestion. The results show that high LE values are observed during the warming phase, and lower values during the cooling phase, similar to T_s and q as depicted in Figure 2 of the main text (at the end of this response). We acknowledge that the original manuscript may have had unclear sentences or descriptions for LE changes. We have revised the manuscript by rewriting the sentences to make it more precise and clear in expressing our viewpoint.

22) *The argument that the use of Pang et al. 2019 is a reliable approach is a circular argument since you are using the estimate of Pang et al. 2019 to compare with the data that Pang et al uses to create the relationship between isotope and temperature.*
Response: Thanks for this comment. To support our estimate, we used simulation data from ECHAM5-wiso (Werner et al., 2011), which calculated precipitation isotopes based on temperature and other factors. We compared the results of our calculation with the simulation data, and the comparison is presented in Figure 2. As shown in the figure, the two methods agree with each other quite well.



Figure 3. The estimated precipitation $\delta^{18}O$ and its standard deviation during the period of 2005-2011. Blue solid line with star marks represents the calculations using the temperature-isotope slope, and the light blue shaded area is the uncertainties. Black solid line with x marks and light grey shaded area displays the ECHAM5-wiso simulation data and its uncertainties, respectively.

23) *L251, L266: It is not correct to say that the meteorological data are less variable in winter. In fact, all meteorological variables are similarly variable as they have about the same standard deviation. Maybe reformulate to "none of the meteorological variables shows a diurnal cycle" or "in the winter data does not show a diurnal signal."*
Response: We appreciate your valuable suggestion. The sentences mentioned in the comment have been revised in the new version of the manuscript.

24) *L260: Please give the value of the used snow density. How does this value compare to the density taken from Laepple et al. (2018) for the DOME-C simulations?*
Response: In Table 1 of main text, we have listed the snow density values at Dome A and Dome C. The snow density value at Dome A (380 kg/m^3) is slightly higher than that at Dome C (350 kg/m^3).

25) *L265-266: How is winter defined? Are all hourly data from June-August used?*
Response: Yes, the winter period corresponds to June-August in Antarctica. During the winter period in Antarctica, hourly meteorological data from clear-sky days were retrieved and then averaged for running simulations at Dome A.

26) *L272: Please provide the value of the used δ-T slope in the text.*
Response: For non-summer seasons, the isotopes of precipitation were also estimated using the regression line (slope of 0.64±0.02, R^2=0.59) of the non-summer precipitation isotopic composition and near surface air temperature at Dome F, Vostok and Dome C compiled by Pang et al. (2019). In the main text, we added the used δ-T slope following the comment.

27) *L273-274: Where is this comparison presented, and why is this relevant here? Did this comparison influence the initial values of $\delta^{18}O_s$? If not, I suggest to remove this.*
Response: We appreciate this suggestion. We used a comparison of $\delta^{18}O_s$ values between the ECWMF-wiso dataset and linear calculations using the δ-T slope to validate the $\delta^{18}O_s$ estimation. The results of this comparison are presented in Figure 3. We observed a strong correlation between the monthly $\delta^{18}O_s$ variations in these two data sources, and their values were similar in each month, indicating that the linear calculations are reliable. Based on this finding, we can confidently state in the main text that the setting of $\delta^{18}O_s$ values are accurate at Dome A. Thus, it is necessary to mention the comparison between $\delta^{18}O_s$ calculations from the δ-T slope and the ECWMF-wiso dataset in the text.

28) *L277: Please add the reference (Ma et al., 2020) behind "measurements" again*
Response: Thanks for reminding this. We have checked and added the reference.

29) *L292: Please clarify: What does the "disequilibrium was included" mean?*
Response: The term "disequilibrium" in the original manuscript refers to the isotopic composition of water vapor being in thermodynamic imbalance with the snow isotopes at the snow-atmosphere interface. During modeling, we assumed that the isotopic composition of water vapor was in equilibrium with the snow isotopes under the initial conditions. However, published observations from other polar sites indicate that "disequilibrium" conditions are common. To test how "disequilibrium" conditions affect simulations of water vapor isotopic composition and snow isotopes, we designed sensitivity experiments. In the section 2.4 of main text, we used the phrase "disequilibrium was included" to accurately describe the case. However, this

description may not be clear to readers. In the revised manuscript, we replaced it with "the isotopic composition of water vapor being in thermodynamic imbalance with the snow isotopes was included" to make it easier to understand.

30) *L300-301: The authors mention snow samples for Dome-C in L200-201. An evaluation of the snow isotopic composition development to observations would be very beneficial for the analysis. The simulated changes in snow isotopic composition seem very small compared to variations observed in surface snow samples.*

Response: We acknowledge that the simulated changes in the isotopic composition of snow do not match well with the observations at Dome C. This error can be attributed to the absence of certain physical mechanisms in the original model. To address this issue, we utilized an updated model, which is mentioned in Figure 1, to re-run simulations during the Jan 5^{th} -16^{th}, 2015 at Dome C. As depicted in Figure 3 of the main text (see details at end of this response), the averaged magnitude of the simulated snow isotopic variations aligns with the stacked observations within 24 hours.

31) *L314-315: It is not correct to say diurnal cycle here, instead, Fig. 4 shows the simulated change isotopic composition within 24 hours when applying an average summer day observed in January 5-12th.*

Response: Thanks, we corrected the L314-315 following the reviewer’s suggestion. The details are as follows:

“The modelled snow $\delta^{18}O$, δD and d-excess also follow a diurnal pattern where higher values occur during the warming phase and lower values during the cooling phase. However, the magnitude of their diurnal variations is smaller than that of water vapor isotopic compositions (see Figs. 3a-3c)”

32) *L319: What does “diurnal variations” mean? Diurnal maximum minus diurnal minimum? Please define. Maybe the term “diurnal range” is more suitable?*

Response: Thanks for this helpful suggestion. The “diurnal variations” in this sentence means the diurnal maximum minus diurnal minimum. To make it more clear, we used the “diurnal range” to replace the “diurnal variations”.

33) *L339: As mentioned above, the changes in isotopic composition in winter are comparable to the ones in summer.*

Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised this sentence as follows:

“As a result, compared to the simulated results in summer, there is no diurnal cycles in snow isotopes in winter, but the changes in water vapor isotopic composition in winter are comparable to the ones in summer.”

34) *L354-355: I cannot confirm this statement based on the figures. The different axis ranges make it difficult to compare.*

Response: In Figure 7 of the original manuscript, we used the red lines to show the sensitivity of simulated results to changes in initial conditions. From Figure 7e and Figure 7f (the picture shown as below), the $\delta^{18}O_v$ changes are more significant than the

$\delta^{18}O_s$, suggesting that the $\delta^{18}O_v$ are more sensitive.



Figure 4. Sensitivity of the modeled results to changes in $\delta^{18}O_{v0}$ and $\delta^{18}O_{s0}$ (citing from the original manuscript)

35) *L359: Please discuss how the simulated results compare to other similar modeling studies, e.g., Wahl et al. (2022) (for Greenland) and Ritter et al. (2016)?*

Response: Thank you for your helpful comment. We have revised the manuscript to include a discussion of the similarities and differences between our calculations and the simulated results of other studies. One significant similarity we found with two similar studies you mentioned is that diurnal variations in snow isotopes and water vapor isotopic composition in the boundary layer can be mainly explained by the atmosphere-snow water vapor exchange through modeling results. Additionally, these studies suggest that the accumulation of isotopic effects from the atmosphere-snow water vapor exchange can lead to isotopic enrichment of the snow layer during the summer, if the snow layer remains consistently exposed at the surface. One main difference we noticed between these studies is the magnitude of diurnal changes in water vapor isotopic composition and snow isotopes. For instance, the diurnal range of snow isotopic composition at Dome C is larger than that at Kohnen station and Dome A, which can be attributed to the stronger variability of humidity gradient and wind speed at Dome C. We have added these comparisons and related discussions to the main text's Discussion section.

The detailed comparison in the main text is shown as follows:

"The spatial difference appears in the diurnal amplitude of water vapor δD across East Antarctic interior region. The modeled value of 33.03‰ at Dome A is slightly less than the averaged observations of 36±6‰ at Kohnen station and the in-situ measurements of 38±2‰ at Dome C (Ritter et al., 2016; Casado et al., 2016). The difference between the two latter locations can be explained by a smaller amplitude of diurnal temperature cycle (8.7 ℃) at Kohnen station, relative to that in Dome C (11.1 ℃). However, there still exists a discrepancy in water vapor δD amplitude when the peak-valley gap of diurnal temperature cycle is the same at Dome A and Dome C. Such an anomaly pattern can be attributed to atmospheric dynamical conditions linked with wind speed. At Dome A, the daily mean wind speed of 2.8 m/s is lower than 3.3 m/s in Dome C and 4.5 m/s in Kohnen station during summer. A small wind speed corresponds to the relatively weak air convection in horizontal orientation. Due to the coupling between upper and lower atmospheric layer, vertical turbulent mixing may decrease with the weakened air convection in the atmospheric near-surface layer (Casado et al., 2018). This change can attenuate molecular exchange between surface snow and water vapor. In parallel, the decrease of vertical turbulence may result in a less efficient turbulent diffusion of water molecules and an elevated contribution of molecular diffusion during air-snow exchange. Changes in water vapor diffusion pathways increase kinetic fractionation and reduce effective isotopic fractionation of water isotopes, leading to a muted fluctuation of modelling water vapor δD in combination with less mass exchange. The surface snow δD displays the synchronization change and different amplitude in diurnal cycles, in accordance with the comparisons of water vapor δD between Dome A and Kohnen Station. The similar trend of snow δD is originated from similar temperature variations on a diurnal scale, because surface snow isotopic composition is mainly influenced by temperature-controlled fractionation of water isotopes during air-snow vapor exchange. This relationship also suggests that the difference in temperature amplitude could be playing a role in the unequal amplitude of snow δD*”.*

36) *L356-358: This basically means that the simulated snow isotopic composition does not significantly change after 24 hours of simulation? How much does it change when letting the simulation run longer?*
Response: Thanks for this constructive suggestion. We have conducted simulations for Dome A over the course of one week during summer, using the updated model. We observed that the isotopic composition of snow became more enriched compared to its initial state (Figure 5).



Figure 5: The changes in snow and water vapor isotopes in 11-day at Dome C simulations

37) *L364-366: Please reformulate this sentence more clearly.*
Response: Thanks for this suggestion. We reformulated this sentence as following:
"*Sublimates mix with water vapor, leading to an increase in vapor $\delta^{18}O$ and δD. This happens because sublimates have higher $\delta^{18}O$ and δD than atmospheric water vapor given the initial conditions (i.e., surface snow also have high $\delta^{18}O$ and δD)*".

38) *L369-370: How is this evident? The authors do not provide evidence for what drives the isotopic composition, neither within their 24-hour simulation nor in a more realistic simulation of a longer time period. The latent heat flux is driven by (1) the near-surface humidity gradient (which, of course, is closely related to the near-surface temperature gradient) and (2) the wind speed. However, this study lacks any evidence that the temperature and humidity drive the surface snow isotopic composition. Please remove this statement.*

Response: Thanks for this suggestion. We acknowledge that original manuscript did not accurately reflect the relationship between temperature, humidity, and water vapor isotopic composition. After calculating the latent heat flux, we agree that the water vapor and snow isotopic composition are likely controlled by the near-surface humidity gradient and wind speed. We have revised this statement to reflect the discussion after this sentence, rather than deleting it. The new statement is as follows:

"Based on Fig. 2, 4c, and 5c, it is clear that the diurnal isotope cycles in surface snow and vapor water have a strong correlation with temperature and humidity."

39) *L371-372: The authors suggest that wind speed doesn't seem to affect the isotopic composition of the surface snow. However, I'd like to point out that they're using an average wind speed over 11 days, which doesn't show the hourly changes. Thus, such simulation does not allow for a statement that wind speed does not drive the snow isotopic composition at Dome-C. For example, let's say, just to make my point, that 90% of the changes in snow type are due to wind speed. If the wind speed increases linearly from 2 to 7 m/s over the first 5.5 days and then decreases from 7 to 2 m/s in the next 5.5 days, the snow isotopes would change mainly driven by the wind speed. However, the daily average of this wind change would always be 4.5 m/s for all 24 hours. So, when they use the daily average wind speed in their simulation, it makes it seem like wind has no effect on the snow isotopic composition, even though in this example, wind was defined to be the main factor driving the isotopic changes.*

Response: We completely agree with the reviewer's viewpoint. The original simulations, which used averaged meteorological conditions over a 24-hour period, failed to accurately reflect the impact of wind on the water vapor and snow isotopic composition at the atmosphere-snow interface. To address this issue, we re-ran the simulations to obtain continuous isotopic variations during the studied period.

Furthermore, we conducted a sensitivity test by varying with a significant diurnal cycle of wind and comparing it with the ones with averaged wind speed. The results, as shown in Figure 6, suggest that strong variability in wind speed will enlarge the variations in latent heat, leading to a more significant diurnal change in water vapor isotopes and snow isotopes.

40) *L386: What does this mean: "This could adversely affect changes in atmospheric dynamical conditions between day and night"? Please clarify*

Response: The statement in this comment suggests that smaller temperature changes within a cloudy day can create relatively stable atmospheric dynamical conditions. As a result, the diurnal variations of latent heat flux in summer cloudy days are less significant than those in summer clear-sky days. This leads to less mass exchange as well as isotope effects during atmosphere-snow water vapor exchanges. To make the statement clearer, we have reformulated it as follows:

"*With the presence of cloud, the differences between the air temperature and surface temperature during the day and night become less pronounced (as shown in Fig. 2). This could have a negative impact on the changes in atmospheric dynamics between day and night, as evidenced by the relatively small magnitude of diurnal variations in Richardson number (as shown in Figs. 4a and 5a).*"

41) *L387-389: The authors cannot state that: There is no diurnal cycle when averaging, but of course, the wind speed varies on an hourly and daily basis, and the standard deviation is not zero.*

Response: Thanks for pointing out this inappropriate statement. After careful consideration, we have decided to remove it as this sentence does not contribute to the following discussion.

42) *L427-429: Again, the simulated change in the isotopic composition of the vapor is of a comparable magnitude as the changes in summer. What do the authors base this statement on?*

Response: It is unclear for the statement in the L427-429 of the original manuscript. We have revised it based on the response to Comment #33.

"<u>The results indicate there is small diurnal changes for snow isotopes over the 24-hour simulation period</u>**".**

43) *L444-446: The CALVA program states a sentence on its website on how to acknowledge them for the dataset correctly.*

Response: Thanks for reminding this. We will use the standard way to express the acknowledgement for the CALVA program in the revised manuscript.

"<u>We also acknowledge using data from the CALVA project and CENECLAM and GLACIOCLIM observatories (http://www-lgge.ujf-grenoble.fr/~christo/calva/)</u>"

44) *References: The two given references for Ma et al. (2020) can currently not be distinguished in the text.*

Response: Thanks for the comment. We would like to clarify that the two papers referenced are published by Ma Bin et al. (2020) and Ma Tianming et al. (2020), respectively. To avoid confusion, we have used the formulation "Ma B. et al. (2020)" and "Ma T. et al. (2020)" when citing these two studies in the text.

45) *Figure 2b: Why is the standard deviation of the latent heat flux so low for cloudy conditions?*

Response: Under cloudy conditions, the relatively low values in the standard deviation of the latent heat flux is mainly attributed to the calculated method (Monte-Carlo method). In the revised manuscript, we directly estimated the standard deviation by stacking the simulated diurnal variations of the latent heat flux at the given days. The corrected results can be seen in the Figure 2b of the revised manuscript.

46) *Figure 3: What is σ for the simulations? Is it the calculated range from the Monte Carlo simulations, or is it the standard deviation of the Monte Carlo simulations?*
Response: The σ in Figure 3 represents the standard deviation of the Monte Carlo simulations. According to the reviewers, the estimates for uncertainty provided in the original manuscript is inappropriate. In the revised manuscript, we have directly estimated the standard deviation by stacking the simulated diurnal variations of snow and water vapor isotopic composition in the individual days. The details can be seen in the Text S2 of the supplemental information (response to Comment #52) and Figure 3 of the main text (at the end of this response).

47) *Figure 3 caption: Add water "vapor" isotopic composition.*
Response: Thanks, Correct.

48) *Figure 4: Again, please be more precise on what "uncertainty" means.*
Response: We have given a detailed explanation in the Comment #46. Please see the response to that comment.

49) *Figure 7: Please provide an explanation of the red lines.*
Response: The red lines in Figure 7 represent the modeled magnitudes of $\delta^{18}O$ diurnal variations in water vapor and snow with the changes in initial conditions. While they in fact show the same meanings as the color bar in each panel, but can give a clear and exact view of sensitivity test results. Thus, we still hold these red lines in the revised manuscript, but we added an explanation in the figure title.

50) *Figure 7 caption: Change "6c and 6d" to "7c and 7d".*
Response: Thanks, Correct.

51) *Supplement material S1: The description of the post-processing of the relative humidity (RHw to RHi) is very difficult to understand. – L51-52: Why do you normalize RHw? – L52: Which surface temperature is used? The calculated Ts based on ERA-5? If so, please discuss the introduced error by normalizing the observations using model data. – L54: (Eq. 15): Do you refer to Eq. 13? – L60: What is an "ideal maximum"? – L60, L61: What do you mean by "each temperature point"? – L63-64: The description of the factor is incomplete (the ratio of es with respect to water to es with respect to ice. Moreover, why do you only apply this factor for super-saturated conditions? The relative humidity should be corrected with respect to ice for sub-saturation as well. – L64: What do you mean by "the rising amplitude of the temperature"?*
Response: We appreciate a lot for the reviewer#2's careful checking and valuable comments for Supplement material S1. This part has been rewritten as follows:

"<u>The raw data of relative humidity (RH) at height z is the relative humidity with respect to the water surface (RH_w), measured with the HMP35D humidity probe (Xiao et al., 2008; Ding et al., 2022). The RH_w can be expressed as a percentage:</u>

$$RH_w = e_w/e_w^s \times 100\% \qquad (S2)$$

where e_w is the water vapor pressure of air (Pa), and e_w^s is the saturated vapor pressure with respect to the water surface at the air temperature (Pa) which can be calculated using the Clausius-Clapeyron equation. When calculating the effective fractionation factor (α_f) in the model (Eq: (15) in the main text), the RH_w were converted to the relative humidity over ice at the temperature of the air (RH_i). The conversion between RH_i and RH_w was proposed based on the calibration procedures of Anderson et al. (1984). The details are as follows: 1) The RH_w observations were firstly rescaled using the maximum RH_w of all measured values at each air temperature point (T_a),

$$RH_w' = RH_w(T_a)/ RH_w^{max}(T_a) \qquad (S3)$$

2) RH_w' values were then converted to RH_i using Eq: (S4) :

$$RH_i = (e_w^s(T_a)/e_i^s(T_a)) \times RH_w' \qquad (S4)$$

where e_i^s represents the saturated vapor pressure with respect to ice at the air temperature (Pa). Like e_w^s, e_i^s was calculated by the Clausius-Clapeyron equation. Based on Eq: (S3) and Eq: (S4), we obtained RH_i as the final result.

In addition, the relative humidity of the air with respect to the surface temperature (h) in Eq: (14) can also be converted from RH_w observations. The first step of procedures for h conversion is the rescaling RH_w based on Eq: (S3), same to the RH_i conversion. The second step is h calculation using the saturated vapor pressure with respect to ice at the surface temperature (Eq: (S5)).

$$h = (e_w^s(T_a)/e_i^s(T_s)) \times RH_w' \qquad (S5)”$$

52) *Supplement material S2: The description of the uncertainty estimate/error propagation is partly unclear and could be improved. Furthermore, the simulation uncertainties are not sufficiently mentioned and discussed in the main manuscript. A Figure in S2 that shows the calculated uncertainties for all variables could be helpful. – L70: How are the ”uncertainties” calculated? Is it the standard deviation? – L72: Which are ”those days”? – L75: Which error the standard deviation is applied? Please provide more details.*

Response: We would like to express our gratitude to the reviewer for reviewing the supplement material S2. The term "uncertainties" in our study represents the standard deviation of each variable. We have estimated them directly by stacking the observations and calculations on the given days in the revised manuscript. The corrections have thus been made in the supplementary document as we have updated our method of estimating uncertainties. The revised Text S2 is as follows:

“At each time step, we first calculated the standard deviation as the uncertainties (1σ) of wind speed, air temperature, relative humidity by stacking the hourly observations from AWS on the selected days for each parameter. The same method was then applied to determine the uncertainty of surface temperature using hourly calculations from Brun et al., (2012). We also used the stacking method to estimate the uncertainties of other calculations such as the latent heat flux. These estimated uncertainties (shaded areas) were plotted in Figures 2 of the main text)

The standard deviation of isotopic values were calculated as the uncertainties at Dome C. This was also done by stacking the continuous simulations for water isotopes over the period studied, from 5th January to 16th January in 2015. However, determining the uncertainties of water isotopes was not possible using this method at Dome A, due to the non-continuous clear-sky and cloudy days in the studied period. Therefore, the uncertainties of water isotopes at Dome A simulated cases were estimated by using the variations of the uncertainties of latent heat (Q_{LE}) and fractionation coefficient (Q_{α}). This was done through the error propagation method for a multi-variable function, as described by Radic et al. (2017). The detailed equations used were as follows:

$$Q_{\delta} = \sqrt{{Q_{\alpha}}^2 + {Q_{LE}}^2} \quad \text{(S6)}$$

where O_{LE} can be determined by the above mentioned method, Q_{α} is calculated from the standard deviation of surface temperature based on the error propagation method."

Supplementary response

The revised figures in the main text are as follows:



Figure 2: Stacks of diurnal cycles of meteorological parameters and the calculated latent heat under summer clear-sky conditions (a), summer highly cloudy conditions (b), and winter conditions (c) at Dome A. The hourly data for air temperature, relative humidity, air pressure and wind speed were averaged by AWS observations over those selected days. The diurnal variations for other three parameters were calculated based on hourly observations. In each panel, the solid line with marks represents the average and the grey shadow is the standard deviation. The background color of pink and blue corresponds to the period dominated by sublimation and deposition, respectively, in a diurnal cycle.



Figure 3: Model simulated diurnal variations of water vapor and snow isotopic compositions at Dome C along with the observations. (a) water vapor $\delta^{18}O$, (b) water vapor δD, (c) water vapor d-excess and (d) snow isotopes. In panels (a)-(c), blue solid line represents the observations of water vapor isotopic composition (δv_{obs}) with the light grey shaded area as the uncertainties (±1σ standard deviation). The red solid line and the light red shaded area depicts the modeled variations of water isotopic composition (δv_{sim}) and correspondingly uncertainties (±1σ). In panel (d), the diurnal variations of modeled snow $\delta^{18}O$ and d-excess are shown as the black solid line and light blue solid line, respectively. Their uncertainties are also displayed with shaded areas like δv_{obs} and δv_{sim} in first three panels. The method for uncertainties estimation can be seen in SI (Texts S2).



Figure 4: The simulated hourly mean vapor exchange flux and variations in atmospheric water vapor and snow isotopes under summer clear-sky conditions at Dome A: (a) Richardson number, (b) friction velocity, (c) vapor exchange flux, (d) snow and water vapor $\delta^{18}O$, (e) snow and water vapor δD, (f) snow and water vapor d-excess. The uncertainties for each variable are displayed by shaded area in each subpanel.



777
778 **Figure 5:** Same to Figure 4 but for Dome A under highly cloudy conditions in summer.



Figure 6: Same to Figure 4 but for Dome A under winter conditions.

End of the responses to Reviewer #2

Reference

Brun, E., Six, D., Picard, G., Vionnet, V., Arnaud, L., Bazile, E., et al.: Snow/atmosphere coupled simulation at Dome C, Antarctica, *Journal of Glaciology*, 57(204), 721-736, doi: 10.3189/002214311797409794, 2011.

Casado, M., Landais, A., Picard, G., Münch, T., Laepple, T., Stenni, B., et al.: Archival processes of the water stable isotope signal in East Antarctic ice cores, *The Cryosphere*, 12(5), 1745-1766, doi: 10.5194/tc-12-1745-2018, 2018.

Hughes, A. G., Wahl, S., Jones, T. R., Zuhr, A., Hörhold, M., White, J. W. C., et al: The role of sublimation as a driver of climate signals in the water isotope content of surface snow Laboratory and field experimental results, *The Cryosphere*, 15(10), 4949-4974, doi: 10.5194/tc-15-4949-2021, 2021.

King, J. C., & Anderson, P. S.: Heat and water vapour fluxes and scalar roughness lengths over an Antarctic ice shelf, *Boundary-Layer Meteorology*, 69, 101–121, doi: org/10.1007/BF00713297, 1994.

Ma, B., Shang, Z., Hu, Y., Hu, K., Wang, Y., Yang, X., et al.: Night-time measurements of astronomical seeing at Dome A in Antarctica, *Nature*, 583(7818), 771–774, doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2489-0, 2020.

Ma, T., Li, L., Li, Y., An, C., Yu, J., Ma, H., et al.: Stable isotopic composition in snowpack along the traverse from a coastal location to Dome A (East Antarctica): Results from observations and numerical modelling, *Polar Science*, 24, 100510, doi: 10.1016/j.polar.2020.100510, 2020.

Ma Y..: Evaluation of Polar WRF Simulations of Atmospheric Circulation. 2012. Chinese Academy of Meteorological Sciences, PhD dissertation, 2012.

Merlivat, L., & Jouzel, J.: Global climatic interpretation of the deuterium-oxygen 18 relationship for precipitation, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 84(C8), 5029, doi: 10.1029/JC084iC08p05029, 1979.

Pang, H., Hou, S., Landais, A., Masson-Delmotte, V., Jouzel, J., Steen-Larsen, H. C., et al.: Influence of Summer Sublimation on δD, δ18O, and δ17O in Precipitation, East Antarctica, and Implications for Climate Reconstruction from Ice Cores, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 124(13), 7339-7358, doi: 10.1029/2018JD030218, 2019.

Ritter, F., Steen-Larsen, H. C., Werner, M., Masson-Delmotte, V., Orsi, A., Behrens, M., et al.: Isotopic exchange on the diurnal scale between near-surface snow and lower atmospheric water vapor at Kohnen station, East Antarctica, *The Cryosphere*, 10(4), 1647-1663, doi: 10.5194/tc-10-1647-2016, 2016.

Touzeau, A., Landais, A., Stenni, B., Uemura, R., Fukui, K., Fujita, S., et al.: Acquisition of isotopic composition for surface snow in East Antarctica and the links to climatic parameters, *The Cryosphere*, 10(2), 837-852, doi:10.5194/tc-10-837-2016, 2016.

van den Broeke, M., van As, D., Reijmer, C. & van de Wal, R.: Sensible heat exchange at the Antarctic snow surface: a study with automatic weather stations. I*nternational Journal of Climatology*, 25, 1081-11010-, doi:10.1002/joc.1152, 2005.

Vignon, E., Genthon, C., Barral, H., Amory, C., Picard, G., Gallée, H. et al.: Momentum- and Heat-Flux Parametrization at Dome C, Antarctica: A Sensitivity Study. *Boundary-Layer Meteorology,* 162, 341–367, doi: 10.1007/s10546-016-0192-3, 2017.

Wahl, S., Steen-Larsen, H. C., Reuder, J., & Hörhold, M.: Quantifying the Stable Water Isotopologue Exchange Between the Snow Surface and Lower Atmosphere by Direct Flux Measurements, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres,* 126(13), doi: 10.1029/2020jd034400, 2021.

Werner, M., Langebroek, P. M., Carlsen, T., Herold, M., & Lohmann, G.: Stable water isotopes in the ECHAM5 general circulation model: Toward high-resolution isotope modeling on a global scale, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmosphere*, 116, 14, doi: 10.1029/2011jd015681, 2011.