

Interactive comment on “Influence of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation on neodymium isotopic composition at the Last Glacial Maximum – a modelling sensitivity study” by T. Arsouze et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 24 April 2008

Review of “Influence of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation on neodymium isotopic composition at the Last Glacial Maximum—a modelling sensitivity study” by T. Arsouze, J.-C. Dutay, M. Kageyama, F. Lacan, R. Alkama, O. Marti, and C. Jeandel, submitted to *Climate of the Past*

The authors used an OGCM to test how changes in ocean circulation, sea ice cover and bathymetry affect the simulated values of ϵ_{Nd} , with the assumption that their parameterization of boundary exchange drives the Nd isotope composition of the ocean. Specifically, they sought to recreate the possible conditions during the Last Glacial Maximum. The authors first ran their simulation using modern ocean conditions, and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



then ran three other simulations that each test conditions that might have existed during the LGM. The authors ran an additional modern simulation where the land-sea distribution was set to that of the LGM, which they used to determine how changes in bathymetry might affect the modeled ϵ_{Nd} values of end-members by restricting the interaction of seawater with certain very unradiogenic margins in the North Atlantic.

The authors are attacking a difficult, but very important question, and because this is the first attempt at solving the problem of how Nd isotopes in the ocean might have changed through time, their paper should be published. However, it is in need of major revisions before it should be considered ready for publication. Below is a list of comments that I hope will help the authors improve their interesting work.

General Comments:

1. My main concern is that the authors do not give the reader the tools to evaluate the ability of their parameterization of boundary exchange to recreate the modern distribution of Nd isotopes in the oceans. Neither in this study nor in Arsouze et al. (2007) is there a figure with a point-by-point comparison of modeled and observed values from the same grid point. The authors should also consider including figures that compare profiles from the model and the data so that they demonstrate the ability of the model to recreate the vertical structures that are present in the ocean, particularly in the Western Atlantic. The presentation of results for the modern simulation in this paper needs significant improvement, as this is the readers' only chance to evaluate the ability of this parameterization to recreate Nd isotopes in the past, which is the stated goal of this paper.

2. Also, the presentation of the LGM results could be improved. The paper focuses on reporting entire basin averages for the different simulations, despite the fact that the cross-sections (figure 3) show significant differences between each LGM simulation and the modern, in addition to significant differences from one individual LGM simulation to the next. The authors might consider reporting averages over certain depth

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

ranges in the northern and southern Atlantic basins, as they would be more instructive than reporting entire basin averages. Some comparison of these depth range averages for the modern control simulation with modern observational data might also be helpful. In addition, the presentation of the cross-sections for the LGM simulations makes it difficult for the reader to determine the ϵ_{Nd} values for each simulation. The authors might consider adding another figure that shows the ϵ_{Nd} values for each cross-section, rather than just the differences between each simulation and the modern.

3. I think that improvements in the presentation of the authors' results will lead to more coherent "Results" and "Discussion" sections.

4. Another area of concern is how uncertainty in the model circulation might affect the results of the modern simulation. The strength of the MOC for the modern control run was admitted to be too weak. An interesting feature of the control run cross-section (figure 3) is that this simulation fails to create a homogenous water mass in the North Atlantic. Instead, there is a strong gradient from the deep to bottom waters of the North Atlantic, with the bottom waters of this simulation yielding ϵ_{Nd} values as low as -7.5–a result that is not at all supported by the available data (Piepgras and Wasserburg (1983)). Even more interesting is the fact that simulations LGMA and LGMB, both with more vigorous MOC, seem to lack this gradient and yield a more homogeneous ϵ_{Nd} value for NADW (I think this is true, but would be sure after the authors make improvements in the presentation of their results). This observation might imply that the circulation in the modern control run is not representative of the modern ocean. Instead, some stronger representation of MOC, as in LGMA and LGMB, may yield a more realistic distribution of Nd isotopes for the deep North Atlantic.

5. In relation to comment 4, another possibility is that the circulation is sufficiently realistic, but that the forcing term is missing some input of unradiogenic Nd in the deepest parts of the North Atlantic basin (i.e. the boundary exchange term is deficient and needs revamping).

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

6. Another area of concern is the lack of information on ϵ_{Nd} values of waters entering the Southern Ocean from the Pacific and Indian Oceans, as both of these should have some affect on the ϵ_{Nd} value of waters exported from the Southern Ocean. It may be the case that changes in the ϵ_{Nd} values of waters entering the Southern Ocean from these other ocean basins are insignificant, but if that is the case, then the authors should mention it.

7. Without specific evidence to the contrary, I am also concerned with the ability of this model, or any model with this parameterization of boundary exchange, to create changes in the southern end-member due to the rapid exchange of Nd in the upper 3000m of the water column, regardless of MOC strength. If we assume that the Southern Ocean primarily reflects mixing of North Atlantic and North Pacific waters entering this basin at depth, then the addition of Nd from boundary exchange at the surface and at depth may erase the ϵ_{Nd} signatures of water masses entering the Southern Ocean.

8. I think some additional sensitivity tests would be most helpful in addressing my concerns in comments 4-7. More model runs that use modern forcing, but have stronger MOC, in addition to a shortened exchange timescale of certain unradiogenic boundaries in the North Atlantic will both increase the amount of NADW reaching the Southern Ocean and lower the ϵ_{Nd} value observed for this end-member. This will help determine the sensitivity of the southern end-member to changes in the North Atlantic. Without sensitivity tests that examine extreme situations we cannot be sure that it is possible to create a 3 ϵ -unit change in the southern end-member by varying the strength of the MOC, given their forcing term.

Specific Comments:

1. No information is given in the abstract on how the authors force the model with respect to the Nd isotope ratio. The forcing is an important piece of information and it probably should be mentioned in the abstract.

2. Page 314; lines 1-4: The author is incorrect in stating that Piotrowski et al. (2005)

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

assume no changes in the ϵ_{Nd} value of the Southern end-member. The point of their paper is that there are changes in the ϵ_{Nd} value of the Southern end-member and that their core location is sensitive to these changes. The author needs to differentiate between what are considered to be global end-members and the end-members that are specific to the Atlantic Ocean. Piotrowski et al. (2005) interpret their data to imply a change in the proportion of North Atlantic and North Pacific waters that are mixed in the Southern Ocean. A change in the proportion of these two end-members would drive a change in the observed ϵ_{Nd} values in the Southern Ocean and in the waters exported from this basin. It would be correct to say that Piotrowski et al. (2005) assume no change in North Atlantic and North Pacific end-members. I think more time should be spent clarifying this paragraph because in it are the reasons for undertaking this study.

3. Page 314; lines 19-21: The authors should qualify that their ability to determine the extent to which changes in circulation drive changes in the northern end-member is limited by the degree to which their parameterization of boundary exchanges reflects reality and the degree to which boundary exchange is the driving force in the distribution of Nd isotopes in the ocean.

4. Page 317; lines 12-24: The authors do address some uncertainties in the boundary exchange parameterization through time, but they do not address the possibility of spatially variable restoring timescales.

5. Page 318; lines 1-4: The authors cite figures in Arsouze et al. (2007) and state that the model successfully simulates the ϵ_{Nd} values of major water masses. The figures referenced in this sentence do not strongly support the statement made by the authors because there are obvious differences between the model and the observed data in these figures. Also, it is difficult to determine the exact offset between the model and the data because the authors do not present a point-by-point comparison, or a comparison of profiles for the modeled and observed data.

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

6. Page 321; lines 2-6: The authors ascribe the lack of agreement between their simulations and the available paleo data simply to the coarse resolution of the model. The lack of agreement could also be created by a deficient forcing term, deficient circulation, or both.

7. Page 321; lines 5-11: The authors mention some complicating factors associated with the observations of ϵ_{Nd} values at the core location of Piotrowski et al. (2005), but do not address how these factors will influence the simulated ϵ_{Nd} values of this model. If they mention these factors they should address their consequences in greater detail.

8. Page 321; lines 23-29: The authors understate the importance of the constraints provided by the data from van de Flierdt et al. (2006). These data show strong evidence that the ϵ_{Nd} value of the northern end-member is stable through time. As a result, the authors should give the constraints provided by this work greater importance in the manuscript, rather than focusing solely on the LGM constraint of Piotrowski et al. (2005).

Technical Comments:

1. Page 310; lines 10: “values are remain”, delete “are” or “remain”
2. Page 321; line 23: make the “V” in van de Flierdt a lowercase
3. Page 332; figure 3: both colorbars are non-linear

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 4, 309, 2008.

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