

Interactive comment on “Dense water formation in the coastal northeastern Adriatic Sea: the NAdEx 2015 experiment” by Ivica Vilibić et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 20 April 2017

General comment to the Authors: The manuscript investigates the dynamics of the coastal areas in the northeastern Adriatic Sea during winter 2015, using numerical models and in situ data. The data were collected during an intense fieldwork that was conducted using a multiplatform approach, involving ADCPs, CTDs, glider and a profiling float. In particular, the authors focus on the possibility that dense water forms even in this area of the northern Adriatic, and not only during severe winters, but also during relatively mild winter (winter 2015 in fact was one of those). The objectives of the paper are sufficiently clear but not well discussed. The structure of the paper could be better organized and the figures and captions are all relevant, but not all the data were shown. There are a number of aspects that need to be clarified to the reader, before the paper would be publishable in Ocean Science. A major comment is that I don't think the authors have uniquely demonstrated that the formation of dense

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



water occurred in the investigated area. Further you have not shown to the reader how mild was winter 2015 compared to other winters. With this in mind, I think the paper is deserves publication after a major revision. Some more detailed comments are: - Page 1, Line 17: should be “accompanied by” - Page 1, Line 18: do not define acronyms in the abstract, but only later on (DWF) - Page 1, Line 25: should be “to be about 1-2” - Page 2, Line 2: should be “mixing on the” - Page 2, Line 5: in addition to heat losses, also evaporation should be mentioned as an important contributing factor - Page 2, Line17: should be “from the eastern coastal areas” - Page 4, Line 26: should be “The atmospheric” - Page 7, Line 16: I think the glider measurements would be important and should be described, and shown - Page 7, Lines 9-18: My main concern here is how can you exclude that advection is the cause of what you observe here? - Page 10, Lines 9-16: there seems to be a contradiction since in the first part you speak about “horizontal salinity gradients” and of the fact that “cooled waters were largely advected to this area”, while afterwards you speak about “DWF in the area”, which for me has not been proven in this paper. - Page 10, Line24-25: this sentence “acted mostly in opposite to the thermally driven buoyancy changes” is not clear at all. - Page 12, Lines 9-22: I don’t understand why you decompose the residence time in along and across and not just use the standard residence time. Besides the mathematical formulation you should give the reader a physical explanation on why you do that and why it should be important. - Page 12, Lines32-33: you say the in the outer basin the residence times “are much lower” (than what) and after this sentence you say that “for the inner basin..residence times are much shorter”. . . .so they are short in and out, but with respect to what. . . ? Really unclear ! - Page 13, Line19: what is the meaning of “This is a baseline Nadex 2015 paper”??? - Page13, Line 22: I don’t think you have demonstrated item (i)! - Page 13, Line32: what is the meaning of “has still excited thermohaline circulation”?? It sounds odd

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/os-2017-6, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

