

Interactive comment on “An assessment of Ozone Mini-holes Representation in Reanalyses Over the Northern Hemisphere” by Luis Millan and Gloria Manney

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 2 May 2017

This is a quality study of the ability of meteorological reanalyses to simulate ozone-miniholes. Most of the conclusions are well supported by the presented results. In particular, it is inferred that the dynamics of the reanalysis models at synoptic scales is deficient and that this is the main reason why the reanalyses do a poor job of simulating ozone mini-holes. My only real negative comment concerns the last paragraph of the Conclusions section on page 9. It states that: “In general, MERRA-2 seems to represent mini-holes more accurately than the rest of the reanalyses.” I don’t understand where this statement is supported in the rest of the text. For example, it is noted several times that ERA-Interim underestimates the number of mini-hole events the least among the reanalyses (34 per cent). Figure 4 shows that the number of events per month is

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



underestimated less by ERA-Interim than by MERRA-2. Only in Figure 6 is there any indication that MERRA-2 might do slightly better in identifying specific mini-holes found in the OMI measurements (238 matches as compared to 214 for ERA-Interim). So, I think this last paragraph needs to be modified to at least say that ERA-Interim does about as well as MERRA-2. ERA-Interim also assimilates the OMI and MLS ozone data.

Overall, the final paragraph of the conclusions section and the data availability section 7 sound a little too much like an advertisement for using reanalysis data to study ozone variability on short time scales. It mentions that “Independent comparisons performed by Wargan et al. (2017) suggest that MERRA-2 upper tropospheric and stratospheric ozone are of sufficient quality for studies requiring high-frequency, highly resolved global ozone maps and variability consistent with dynamics.” This sentence needs to be removed in this reviewer’s opinion. The results of this study clearly show that none of the reanalyses is of sufficient quality for this purpose. Any future studies of ozone mini-holes, for example, must use actual satellite ozone measurements such as OMI. This should be the main conclusion of the paper. Please revise the text.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., doi:10.5194/acp-2017-341, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

