

Interactive comment on “Synoptically-induced variability in the microphysical properties of the South East Pacific stratocumulus deck” by D. Painemal and P. Zuidema

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 4 February 2010

General comments

This paper uses a composite analysis based on a threshold for high and low cloud droplet number concentrations (Nd) in the Arica Bight area to examine the correlation with both synoptic variability and with the large scale properties of the stratocumulus deck in the southeast Pacific. I found the paper interesting and I liked the method of looking at different composites to understand links between the meteorology and the stratocumulus properties.

One aspect of the paper linked the synoptic scale meteorology to changes in Nd which was used as a proxy for the coastal aerosol loading. However the discussion on the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



transport of aerosol from anthropogenic sources in these synoptic situations was speculative and could be strengthened with further model or observational evidence. The other aspect of the paper discussed differences in the macrophysics of the stratocumulus in both this coastal and in more remote regions for the two composite cases. The authors conclude that “the free tropospheric meridional wind at 85W is dominant in establishing the southeast Pacific stratocumulus cloud coverage at synoptic timescales” and that it is “arguably our most radiatively important finding”. It would therefore have been of interest to do the composite analysis based on this synoptic control rather than coastal Nd. Both aspects are interesting in their own right. However it would be of interest to explore the above points in a bit more detail in order to draw firmer conclusions.

I would also suggest that the authors think about changing the title of the paper as it gives the reader the impression that it focuses solely on synoptic influences on cloud microphysics.

Specific comments

1) Line 18 p. 25525: “Current IPCC estimates. . . .” I think that this sentence is somewhat misleading as the latest IPCC report gives a median aerosol cloud albedo effect plus direct radiative forcing of -1.3 Wm^{-2} with a -0.5 to -2.2 Wm^{-2} 90% confidence range (Climate Change 2007: Working Group I: The Physical Science Basis, section 2.92). This range spans the estimate from the Murphy et al. (2009) paper. A reference to the IPCC report is also required.

2) Line 17 p. 25527: “We use NCEP/NCAR reanalysis . . . and assume it is accurate except near the coast”. Can you justify this assumption? The reanalysis certainly looks poor ~ 500 km away from the coast as shown in figure 7 where it is unable to represent the strong temperature inversion at the top of the marine boundary layer. What do the reanalysis profiles look like at Antofagasta – do they reproduce the same features as shown in the observations in fig 7? Are you able to compare the reanalysis against

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

sounding data over the oceanic regions from the ship/aircraft during the VOCALS-REX period? It is not clear to the reader at present that the reanalysis data is realistic. This is important as it is used extensively in section 4.

3) Line 10 p. 25529: The satellite derived cloud properties and TOA radiation are measured at ~10:30 LT but the QuickSCAT winds are measured at 18:00 LT. Munoz (2008) however show a diurnal cycle in the QuickSCAT winds in this region, maximising in an area between 20-30S and from the coast to 75W. Do you expect the time difference between the observed winds and clouds/radiation to impact the results presented?

4) Line 5 p. 25531: “We attempt to minimize. . . .for overcast (or nearly so) pixels.” What is meant by “or nearly so”? Do you place some limits on cloud fraction?

5) Line 16 p. 25533: This paragraph highlights specific research flights which correspond to high and low Nd cases from two of the aircraft that participated in VOCALS-REx. These specific flights however are not particularly relevant to the paper. Bearing in mind that there were additional measurement platforms that took part in VOCALS-REx (five research aircraft for example) it might be more instructive to simply state all high and low Nd days that occurred during the VOCALS-REx period.

6) Line 6 p. 25534: “Near Antofagasta (23.43S; small black square)” This square needs to be added to figure 3.

7) Line 10 p. 25534: The time series data for winds, cloud top height and geopotential height are taken from different spatial regions. A bit more information is required as to why these regions are chosen. For example I would envisage that it is the coastal winds that are important for the transport of anthropogenic aerosol and would therefore contribute significantly to the variability in Nd. However the wind data is averaged over a much larger area that includes clean maritime air masses.

8) Line 17 p. 25534: “MAX (MIN) Nd days co-occur with weaker (stronger) coastal winds” yet as mentioned above the wind data is averaged over an area that extends

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

further out into the Pacific (70-100W) and may not be representative of the coastal wind.

9) Line 14 p. 25536: The height of the temperature inversion (fig 7a) looks the same for both the MAX and MIN Nd cases whereas the text states that the radiosonde data show that the “MAX Nd cases are typically associated with a shallower boundary layer”.

10) Line 20 p. 25536: It is inferred that there is increased subsidence in the MAX Nd case from the increase in the observed easterly wind above the inversion as shown in figure 7. A bit more explanation as to how the subsidence is calculated from these soundings is required. Further Munoz (2005) show a large diurnal cycle in the winds above the boundary layer whereas figure 7 is for 12 UTC only. If observations from a different time were chosen would it impact your discussion?

11) Line 1 p. 25543: As mentioned later in the text there are anthropogenic sources above the marine boundary layer along the coast. With enhanced easterlies above the inversion you might expect aerosols from these sources to be advected out above the Sc, particularly if enhanced subsidence has lowered the cloud top height. This aerosol would presumably be entrained into the cloud layer downwind on some timescale. Back trajectory analysis would aid the discussion of potential sources for high Nd days. As the paper stands at present I am not convinced that the discussion on aerosol transport in this section (with no observational or model evidence) answers the question raised in the introduction – “Do atmospheric conditions favour aerosol incorporation into the cloud through free-tropospheric subsidence, or from within the boundary layer?”

12) At several points in the text it is stated that “Along 85W”. Should this be “At 85W”?

Additional references

Munoz, R. C.: Diurnal cycle of surface winds over the subtropical southeast Pacific, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, D13107, doi:10.1029/2008JD009957, 2008.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 9, 25523, 2009.

C10504

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

