

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Initial Spread of <sup>137</sup>Cs over the shelf of Japan: a study using the high-resolution global-coastal nesting ocean model” by Z. Lai et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 18 March 2013

### General Comments

This study conducted a numerical simulation of <sup>137</sup>Cs released from the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plants using a high resolution FVCOM model. The results showed that the high resolution model is better than those coarse resolution models operated in previous studies to capture the initial spread of <sup>137</sup>Cs. The topic is of interest. I have a few concerns and hope they can be clarified before publication of this manuscript.

### Specific comments

The most important finding of this study is that the source point of <sup>137</sup>Cs is critical to

C368

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



resolve the dispersion process. In front of the nuclear plant, there is a seawall structure. The power plant intakes water from inside of the seawall structure and discharges water outside the seawall structure on the north and south sides (namely, the north and south discharging canals), respectively. The two discharging canals were considered the point sources of the release of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  (Tsumune et al, 2012; Estournel et al., 2012). In this study, however, the discharge point of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  is located inside the seawall structure (Figures 2 and 7), rather than at the two discharging canals. It seems that this treatment of source point allows  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  to disperse farther seaward such that the modeled  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  concentrations match the measurements at the MEXT stations better than the previous studies. My concern is whether this setup of the source of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  is reasonable, and I hope this can be confirmed by someone who is familiar with the study site.

Because the source term of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  is determined by the inverse method, this study as well as the previous work (Kawamura et al., 2011; Tsumune et al, 2012; Estournel et al., 2012) can obtain reliable results near the power plant. This study further improved the results at MEXT stations, but still has relative large discrepancies between model and observation at the WHOI stations (Figures 10 and 11, and notice the log scale). Does this indicate that the high resolution grid actually didn't help improve much of the prediction, and the improvement at the MEXT sites merely comes from the setup of the source point of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$ ?

Even though this is a short paper, providing some details of the inverse method might help understand the model results if it is not exactly the same as that of Tsumune et al. (2012). For example, the initial  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  concentration, the volume of water in which  $^{137}\text{Cs}$  was released, and the estimated release rate of  $^{137}\text{Cs}$ , etc.

Please add legends in Figures 4, 10, and 12.

## Reference

Estournel, C., Bosc E., Bocquet, M., Ulses, C., Marsaleix, P., Winiarek, V., Osvath, I., Nguyen, C., Duhaut, T., Lyard, F., Michaud, H., and Auchair, F.: Assessment of the

**BGD**

10, C368–C370, 2013

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



amount of cesium-137 released into the Pacific Ocean after the Fukushima accident and analysis of its dispersion in Japanese coastal waters, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, C11014, doi:10.1029/2012JC007933, 2012.

Kawamura, H., Kobayashi, T., Furuno, A., In, T., Ishikawa, Y., Nakayama, T., Shima, S., and Awaji T.: Preliminary numerical experiments on oceanic dispersion of <sup>131</sup>I and <sup>137</sup>Cs discharged into the ocean because of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant disaster, *J. Nucl. Sci. Tech.*, 48, 11, 1349-1356, 2011.

Tsumune, D., Tsubono, T., Aoyama, M., and Hirose, K.: Distribution of oceanic <sup>137</sup>Cs from the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant simulated numerically by a regional ocean model, *J. Environ. Radioact.*, 111, 100-108, 2012.

---

Interactive comment on *Biogeosciences Discuss.*, 10, 1929, 2013.

**BGD**

10, C368–C370, 2013

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

