Atmospheric
Chemistry
and Physics
Discussions

ACPD

Interactive
comment

Interactive comment on "Ozone sensitivity to varying greenhouse gases and ozone-depleting substances in CCMI simulations" *by* Olaf Morgenstern et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 7 August 2017

This paper presents results from simulations, coordinated under the CCMI-1 initiative, performed from a number of chemistry climate models. These results have an interest to the climate community at large as they outline how the simulated ozone field in these different models is impacted by changes in a number of forcings, i.e., CH_4, N_2O, Cl_{eq} and CO_2^{eq}.

The CCMI-1 initiative should provide ozone climatologies to climate models that use prescribed ozone fields in CMIP6 simulations, and this paper outlines the robust or non robust features of these climatologies. The paper is relatively clear in its presentation of the objectives, the method used, the results. I think that on the basis of these results

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

adding in this paper some recommendations with regards to the production of these climatologies would improve the interest of the paper.

I recommend publication of this paper in ACP. Please find below my comments, questions and remarks, first the more important ones and then the minor ones.

- line 26 and line : "there is a requirement for a robust mechanism...": as indicated in my summary of the paper, the paper would gain including indications for this robust mechanism.

- line 94: please describe how the various gases are grouped into CO_2^{eq}

- line 142: "and references therein": it would be useful to have here a synthesis of the main differences between these models that could have an impact on the results analysed in this paper.

- line 154: I would think that the comment here is somehow misleading. Even with prescribed or only partially interactive tropospheric composition there is a response of ozone in the stratosphere to surface methane changes as for instance is illustrated in Figure 1 for the CCSRNIES model. Therefore there should be a response of the total-column ozone. Please clarify this paragraph.

- line 161 equation 1: the text specifies line 171 that ΔCH_4 is the global-mean methane mixing ratio. Shouldn't it rather be the global-mean surface methane mixing ratio? Please specify similarly what is ΔN_2O, ΔCl^{eq} as you in particular indicate that $Cl^{e}q$ is shifted by 4 years, and ΔCO_2^{eq}.

- line 207: "relatively pronounced negative feedback" is not so clear in Figure 1 for WACCM. Please modify the comment.

- line 238: "whereas CESM1-WACCM, NIWA-UKCA, and SOCOL-3 produce partly insignificant decreases in most regions": if the change appears in white in the

figure, how can you conclude that it is a decrease or an increase? and according to figure 4, CMAM has larger areas with non significant results than NIWA-UKCA. Please amend the comments in the text.

- line 239: "In CMAM ...": I don't agree with this statement: from 100 to 1 hPa Figure 4 shows significant large decreases of ozone when N2O increases.

- in all figures with presentation of the NIWA-UKCA model please convert the vertical coordinate from km to hPa. What you will then present will be a better approximation then what readers would obtain doing it at glance in order to compare the NIWA-UKCA results with the results of the other models.

- line 341: "reductions of sea ice cover" please explicit here or in the presentation of the models which models do not use a prescribed sea ice albedo.

My minor or technical comments are the following:

- line 25: "first phase of CCMI": add "(CCMI-1)"

- line 57: "lower and middle atmosphere": please indicate a range of pressures

- line 62: correct "to due" with "due to"

- line 97: please specify the scenario

- line 112: "final section": please speficy the section number

- line 184: "multiple simulations"

- line 278: please explicit EESC acronym

- legend figure 7 and figure 8: replace Cl_y by Cl_{eq}

C3

ACPD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper