

Interactive comment on “Surface circulation and upwelling patterns around Sri Lanka” by A. de Vos et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 14 January 2014

General comments:

This study discusses near-surface circulation and coastal upwelling around Sri Lanka using satellite data and the Regional Ocean Modeling Systems (ROMS). The model was run for 2 year period to investigate the seasonal and shorter term variability. The model result shows that the transport of eastward South East Monsoon Current (SMC) during the Southwest (SW) Monsoon is 11.5 Sv while the transport of the westward Northeast Monsoon Current (NMC) during the Northeast (NE) Monsoon is 9.5 Sv. Based on a series of model experiments, they concluded that Sri Lanka Dome is primarily the result of the interaction between SMC and the Island. Also, they found that the major upwelling region is located along the south coast during both monsoon periods. This explains the blue whale aggregations in this region in both monsoon periods.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

This is the first detailed analysis which focuses on the circulation and upwelling around Sri Lanka using a high resolution (2 km) model in relation to the blue whale aggregations. Thus the results are worth publishing. However, I have several major concerns described below.

Major points:

1. Page 14961 "Model hindcasts were undertaken over a 2 yr period (2010 and 2011)."

This is probably one of the worst periods to discuss the seasonal variation. This is the period of very strong 2010-2011 La Nina. Pacific SST anomalies associated with ENSO influence surface winds (and thus ocean currents) over the Indian Ocean through atmospheric bridge. Therefore we expect that the circulation in the tropical Indian Ocean is far from the normal at least during 2010-early 2011, which includes the analysis period.

The model should be run for a longer period to discuss the seasonal variation. If it is not possible, it should be run during the period of normal year. If the new experiments are not possible, the authors should justify that the model experiment period is appropriate for studying the seasonal cycle. For example, surface wind variability during 2011 should be compared with other years, and describe how the wind fields during 2011 around Sri Lanka are different from those in other years.

The authors argue that "the predicted transport for the SMC and NMC of 11.5 and 9.5 Sv respectively are more realistic than previous estimates" (page 14975). But this discrepancy could be due to the interannual variation.

2. Upwelling is inferred from the satellite-derived and model SSTs. The upwelling should be explicitly described from the divergence field of surface currents derived from the model output. Maps of the divergence field on different time scales should be created to confirm the region of upwelling inferred from SST fields.

3. Page 14970, "a primary formation mechanism of the SD is the interaction between

the SMC and the land mass of Sri Lanka. This does not rule out the possibility that Ekman pumping may play a role in strengthening the dome"

The relative importance of Ekman pumping and the interaction between SMC and Island is not known from a series of model experiments. If the authors want to argue that the interaction between Island and SMC is "primary" mechanism, at least the Ekman pumping should be calculated, and discuss the magnitude of SD possibly formed by Ekman pumping only.

4. Page 14969 "..resulting in a convergence region" along the southern half of the island"

It is not clear what "a convergence region" means in this case. Is it a convergence of the velocity component along the coast? The contours in Fig. 14 should be clearly explained. What are the values of these contours?

The explanation of the relation between converging currents and upwelling is found near the end of the discussion (page 14974). This explanation should be provided earlier when the discussion of the convergence of the current and upwelling begins. This discussion is quite confusing in the current form.

5. Arrows (velocity vector) in most of the figures are very difficult to see. They should be improved. For example, the resolution could be lower and the size of the arrow could be bigger in some of the figures.

Minor points:

1. Page: 14956 "The Bay of Bengal receives ~ 1500 km³/yr of freshwater through freshwater run-off whilst the total total freshwater input into the Arabian Sea is ~ 190 km³/yr"

A reference of these values would be useful.

2. Page 14957 last paragraph "This circulation pattern is confirmed by Shankar et al.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



(2002). However, Varkey et al. (1996) and Shankar and Shetye (1997) both provide a different interpretation and suggest that currents along the east coast of Sri Lanka flow south to north irrespective of season."

It should be explained how these contradictory results are reconciled based on this study?

3. Page 14960 "This model was driven with 3 hourly atmospheric forcing and daily surface heat and freshwater fluxes using ECMWF ERA interim data"

This is not clear. Surface fluxes are also atmospheric forcing. 3 hourly surface wind stress from ERA Interim are used? Is the solar radiation daily (not include the diurnal cycle)? In general, the model SST, air temperature and humidity from the reanalysis are used to calculate latent and sensible heat fluxes in order to avoid the SST trend. In this study, is the surface heat flux directly derived from ERA Interim? If so, are there large SST trends in the model output?

4. Page 14966, 2nd paragraph "During the NE monsoon, currents along the east coast of Sri Lanka flow southwards closer to the coast and northwards further offshore, separated by a shear zone (Figs 10a, 4a and 4b)"

It is not clear in Fig. 10a.

5. Page 14975, conclusion 1 "The predicted transport for the SMC and NMC of 11.5 and 9.5 Sv respectively are more realistic than previous estimates."

The difference could be due to the interannual variation as mentioned in the major point (1).

6. Fig. 5

Could the size of two panels be the same for the comparison?

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 14953, 2013.