Clim. Past Discuss., 7, C1137–C1139, 2011
www.clim-past-discuss.net/7/C1137/2011/

Climate of the Past Discussions

Interactive comment on "The Middle Miocene climate as modelled in an atmosphere-ocean-biosphere model" *by* M. Krapp and J. H. Jungclaus

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 July 2011

In this manuscript, Krapp and Jungclaus describe simulations of the middle Miocene climate using a coupled atmosphere-ocean-biosphere Earth system model (the MPI-ESM). Proxy reconstructions of the middle Miocene climate suggest significantly warmer then present global mean temperatures as well as a reduced equator-to pole temperature gradient. A number of Miocene model studies has been performed previously, and in general these studies were not able to fully capture the reduced meridional temperature gradient. As in the earlier studies, except for more idealized studies (von der Heydt and Dijkstra 2006), no dynamic ocean has been included, the aim of the present study is to explore the role of ocean circulation changes on the meridional temperature gradient, i.e., meridional heat transport.

While the model setup is appropriate, I fully agree with the previous referee in that the analysis of the model output should be much more thorough and focused on the main question of the study. Though the main goal is well formulated, the results and conclusion sections are much too descriptive and unfocused. Comparisons with the previous model studies (You et al. 2009 and Tong et al.) could be much more critical and need to acknowledge that different models are being used. Some of the differences may be attributed to model differences and others to the experimental setup, and this needs to be discussed. Climate sensitivity is, for example much larger in the present study than in You et al., but why is that? Does the MPI-ESM show a larger sensitivity than the CCSM also in present-day (IPCC) simulations? This issue needs more analysis.

The changes in the ocean meridional overturning circulation need to be analysed much more carefully, this is indeed an interesting result and in addition contribute to the main aim of the study. The MOC remains about equal in the CTRL and MIOC360 simulations, even though the Panama Seaway is open in the MIOC360, but it seems that this is due to the fact that the Greenland Scotland Ridge is deeper at the same time. What is puzzling is that the Atlantic-Pacific salinity difference increases while there should be a vigorous exchange of water between the two basins. Further analysis should include, e.g., the salt transport between the basins. It remains a bit suspicious that the figures of the barotropic stream function in the ocean does not include the ACC region. What happens there? Wind changes and ACC strength could also influence the MOC strength.

Another interesting result that needs further attention is that the oceanic heat transport changes are basically compensated by atmospheric heat transport. Why is that?

In conclusion, I recommend the paper to be considerably revised and further analysis necessary before it can be published in Climate of the Past.

Minor points: Page 1941, l. 5-10: I don't understand the estimate of the temperature increase due to the "direct" effect of topography. How is that estimated? From the table

CPD

7, C1137–C1139, 2011

I get to different values.

Page 1941, l. 25: remove “due to”

Page 1944, l.24: can be contributed → I would say “ can be attributed to. . .

Page 1948, last line: my → may

Page 1949, l. 17: remove “to that”

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 7, 1935, 2011.