

# ***Interactive comment on* “The iron budget in ocean surface waters in the 20th and 21st centuries: projections by the Community Earth System Model version 1” by K. Misumi et al.**

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 30 May 2013

I am not a modeller so I will not attempt to evaluate the details of the modelling results reported here, although I note the modelling system appears to be widely used and reasonably well validated. I was surprised by the scale of flow changes projected to occur over a 100 year time scale (p8516) which seem very large, and the comparison of modelled and observed Fe concentrations (Fig 4) are not particularly convincing. The ocean Fe distribution depends of course on inputs and circulation discussed here, but also and removal rates which depend on the Fe complexation and scavenging modelling which is not I think described here.

Despite these comments I think the authors explore an interesting idea of whether circulation changes will alter Fe cycling. As they note both circulation and Fe supply will

C2371

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



change over coming decades as discussed by Mark Moore et al in their recent Nature Geosciences paper. That paper did not consider the subtler question considered here of whether the circulation changes can alter the internal cycling and supply of Fe. In that sense I was not sure that the comparison of physical supply and FRC (p8518) is particularly useful because this is a bit like comparing new and net production, although of course for the phytoplankton it is simply an issue of Fe supply.

The overall conclusion section of the paper I think elegantly make the main points from this paper, that a general warming and increase of stratification, need not lead to lower supply of Fe from deep water to the euphotic zone everywhere, and indeed in some of the critical HNLC regions Fe supply from below could be enhanced and so also primary production. However, this conclusion is extended within this paper to a detailed discussion of how circulation may change around the Antarctic and Indonesia and with it Fe supply. My feeling is that this kind of large scale model is not well suited to these detailed local scale changes in circulation, and indeed the authors explicitly note the problems they have simulating the west Pacific region. Furthermore in the southern part of the Southern Ocean (in their terminology) we do know that local circulation and local topography play a key role in Fe supply from the blooms around the peninsula and South Georgia for example, so the argument that most of the Fe supply comes from below does not seem to accord with the field data. The authors basically seem to acknowledge this in their conclusions where they say that the physics in these models need to be better, although I wonder if the best strategy might not be to use more detailed regional models, rather than global ones, but that is a discussion for the modelling community.

However, I would say that if the main points of the paper are as summarised in the conclusions, and if the authors hope to reach a wide audience, then the paper could perhaps be reduced in size and simplified (perhaps with details in supplementary material) and try in some way to help the reader through the mass of acronyms (MIXn and MIXv etc.) which really began to confuse me. This simplification might encourage

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



a wide readership from beyond the modelling community to consider the potentially rather important conclusions within this paper.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 8505, 2013.

**BGD**

10, C2371–C2373, 2013

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C2373

