

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Length and time scales of atmospheric moisture recycling” by R. J. van der Ent and H. H. G. Savenije***

**R. J. van der Ent and H. H. G. Savenije**

r.j.vanderent@tudelft.nl

Received and published: 17 November 2010

We would like to thank Heini Wernli and Harald Sodemann for their detailed comments. They note that the paper proposes a novel approach in order to overcome the scale- and shape-dependence of regional moisture recycling ratios resulting in length and time scale metrics (we prefer to talk about metrics rather than parameters). However, they note that the assumptions to derive these metrics is not properly discussed and say the length scale metrics might lead to wrong conclusions about the moisture transport in the atmosphere. We find that this conclusion stems from misinterpretation of the manuscript and we will clarify this and other issues raised below.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

*“(1) As mentioned in the review by F. Dominguez, the assumptions (and simplifications) behind the approach used in section 2.2 should be discussed in greater detail.”*

We replied to this issue in the reply to Francina Dominguez; with the use of (Dominguez et al., 2006, Eq. 20) instead of (Savenije, 1995, Eqs. 14 and 17) our Eq. (7) is no longer subject to these assumptions.

*“(2) The derivation of a length scale for moisture recycling is not very clearly presented and contains unconsolidated aspects (see review by F. Dominguez, her point 3). The added value of the parameter does not become obvious.”*

As mentioned in the previous replies, the added value of  $\lambda$  is the very fact that this metric is scale- and shape-independent and thus allows for a fair comparison of regional moisture recycling between seasons and regions as opposed to the scale- and shape-dependent regional precipitation recycling ratio  $\rho_r$ .

*“The dimensionless recycling ratios  $\rho_r$  (and  $\varepsilon_r$ ) are monotonously transferred into a measure of dimension [L] by dividing the quantity  $\Delta x$  by a rather complicated expression which only contains  $\rho_r$  (or  $\varepsilon_r$ ). Eq. (14) describes this monotonous transformation from the quantities  $\lambda_r$  into  $\lambda_\gamma$ . The additional new parameter is  $\Delta x$ , which mainly serves to account for smaller grid box sizes with higher latitude. Why this  $\Delta x$  would be the “representative length of the grid cell” (pg. 21875, L. 1) is not clear without better justification. It would be insightful to provide plots of how Eq. (14) is mapping values of  $\gamma_r$  to values of  $\gamma_\gamma$  for the range of  $\Delta x$  occurring at a  $1.5 \times 1.5$  deg resolution.”*

We assume that the reviewers mean the transformation of  $\gamma_r$  into  $\lambda_\gamma$ , since this is what Eq. (14) does. We like to note that the quantity  $\Delta x$  is not ‘new’ since all Eqs. (6) to (14) have an distance or length component  $x$ . Once again,  $\Delta x$  is the length of a trajectory, which for a grid cell is its representative (or trajectory) length as defined in Eq. (16). Equation (14) does nothing more than providing an exact solution for solving

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Eq. (8), (10) or (12) with respect to  $\lambda_\gamma$ . This 'scaling law' (Eq. (14)) follows directly from the basic process equation, which in the new manuscript will be Eq. (C5) based on Dominguez et al. (2006, Eq. 20). Please refer to our reply to Francina Dominguez for more details.

*“Comparing Fig. 4c and 5a (or 4d and 5b) apart from the color scale does not reveal any clear differences, as would be expected from a monotonous transformation”.*

In this case one should compare Figs. 4a and 5a (or Figs. 4b and 5b) as this is what Eq. (14) solves. From the comparison of these figure one can in fact observe clear differences.

*“(3) In the abstract it is claimed that the authors present an approach to quantify the spatial and temporal scale of moisture recycling, independent of the size and shape of the region under study. However, this is in fact not explicitly demonstrated in the manuscript. To support this claim, it would be necessary to show a thorough comparison of the measures calculated for areas of different size and shape. The example in Table 2 does not suffice to make such a claim, since only two differently sized areas from two different regions are compared. Instead, several differently sized areas in the same region would have to be compared with one another.”*

The claim is supported by the mathematical derivation of the length and time scales. So, in fact it is demonstrated in the manuscript that the presented metrics are independent of size and shape of the region under study. We like to stress that different grid cell sizes would not lead to different values  $\lambda_\gamma$ , but would only show less or more detail. Maybe this is difficult to be seen from Eqs. (13) and (14), but imagine a case were both  $\gamma_r$  and  $\Delta x$  are small and the moisture trajectory  $\Delta x$  is equal to the width of a grid cell. In this case Eq. (13) can be simplified further to:

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

$$\lambda_\gamma \approx \frac{\Delta x}{2\gamma_r}$$

(C11)

If now the width of the grid cell  $\Delta x$  would increase with a factor 2, also the regional recycling ratio  $\gamma_r$  would increase by a factor 2, thus meaning that  $\lambda_\gamma$  remains equal. For larger  $\gamma_r$  and  $\Delta x$  one has to make use of a 'scaling law'. The scaling law (Eq. (14)) proposed here follows directly from the basic process equation, which in the new manuscript will be Eq. (C5) based on Dominguez et al. (2006, Eq. 20). This is better than all previously proposed scaling laws (see Table 1), who did not use a process equation but merely a curve fitting.. Furthermore, scale- and shape-independence of the metrics is demonstrated by comparison of Figs. 4 and 5, where clear differences can be observed. In addition, it is illustrated in detail in Table 2.

### Physical interpretation of $\lambda_\rho$ and $\lambda_\varepsilon$

Both points 4 and 5 of the reviewers relate to the physical meaningfulness of the moisture recycling length scales  $\lambda_\rho$  and  $\lambda_\varepsilon$ . The reviewers wonder what is meant by: "if all ... conditions would be the same upwind?" Certainly we do not assume moisture recycling to remain constant along an atmospheric pathway which is longer the grid cell width. Instead, we meant to stress that  $\lambda_\rho$  and  $\lambda_\varepsilon$  should indeed be interpreted with caution as they are only valid for the grid cell for which they have been calculated. As indicated in the reply to Michael Bosilovich,  $\lambda_\rho$  and  $\lambda_\varepsilon$  are process scales and not actual travel distances. Because our formulation lead to misunderstandings we shall revise the paper accordingly: in the final manuscript we will make note of the difference between our 'local' length scales of atmospheric moisture recycling and actual travel distances (e.g. Sodemann et al., 2008).

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



## References

Dominguez, F., Kumar, P., Liang, X. Z., and Ting, M.: Impact of atmospheric moisture storage on precipitation recycling, *J. Clim.*, 19, 1513-1530, 2006.

Savenije, H. H. G.: New definitions for moisture recycling and the relationship with land-use changes in the Sahel, *J. Hydrol.*, 167, 57-78, 1995.

Sodemann, H., Schwierz, C., and Wernli, H.: Interannual variability of Greenland winter precipitation sources: Lagrangian moisture diagnostic and North Atlantic Oscillation influence, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D03107, 10.1029/2007jd008503, 2008.

---

[Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.](#), 10, 21867, 2010.

ACPD

10, C9866–C9870, 2010

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C9870

