

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Hydration or dehydration: competing effects of upper tropospheric cloud radiation on the TTL water vapor” by L. Wu et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 10 April 2012

Wu et al. present the results of a modelling study of the effects of clouds on water vapor in the tropical tropopause layer. The model they use is a ‘tropical channel’ version of WRF, and the experiment they perform is evaluation of the differences of the model state when cloud radiative effects are included/excluded. The study address a very important problem, and the setup of the experiment seems appropriate for the problem at hand. However, I have a number of concerns that need to be addressed in the revised version. These are:

(i) The paper rather casually states that the cloud radiative effects leads to enhanced “vertical ascent” (e.g. P4656/L11). Conventional wisdom holds that inhomogeneities in the radiative properties of the atmosphere impact vertical motion on a scale that

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

is related to the scale of inhomogeneity. So, one would expect that the clouds in the tropics may lead to in-cloud heating, but that, since one would expect the tropical average diabatic upwelling to be set by the large-scale forcing, tropical average temperatures increase (what you indeed observe), such that the tropical average radiative heating changes little (because the cloud-heating is largely compensated by the enhanced emissions from the warmer atmosphere). There is some discussion of this point (e.g. P4665/L10ff), but this point needs to be clarified, and the first figure I'd like to see is the diabatic heat budget (with all terms, not just the cloud radiative heating as shown in Figure 4; and for the tropics as a whole) of the model runs. Without this information, it is difficult for me to assess this paper. (I agree that Figure 7 gives the impression of enhanced vertical motion - if this is the case, then this is important and the paper needs to explain what is happening.)

(ii) I was rather confused by the description of the model setup. For instance, it is said that ERA-Interim provides "north-south" and "lower boundary" conditions (P4659/L16), but: (1) We're not told at what level the "lower boundary" is, is this the surface (and you take surface data from Interim), or somewhere in the troposphere? (2) On the previous line it is said that "periodic boundary conditions is used in the east-west direction" (I don't understand). (3) The boundary conditions are updated every 5 days - what is happening during these 5 days? (4) Which fields from Interim are used? Temperature, winds, moisture, others? The paper casually states (line 11ff) that the WRF model is run not centered at the equator because of a "high bias in the Southern Hemisphere ... which appears to be related to poor representation of the stratospheric circulation in this version of WRF". I can't see any reason why the Southern hemisphere should be better/worse than the Northern hemisphere, and I need to be convinced that this problem does not reflect a deeper problem with the whole experimental setup.

Minor comments:

P4664/L9: This sentence makes no sense to me; a warming does not increase the

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

threshold of ice formation, and a larger advective water flux does not necessarily lead to a moistening - it also depends on the response of the sink term.

---

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 12, 4655, 2012.

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper