

Interactive comment on “On the determination of the global cloud feedback from satellite measurements” by T. Masters

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 February 2012

Satellite observations of radiative fluxes and their responses to interannual variation in surface temperature are used to infer cloud feedbacks over the period 2000-2010. Cloud and non-cloud influences on the radiation budget changes (for both longwave and shortwave) are computed and compared with a previous estimate that combined the same data source with a reanalysis model of clear-sky fluxes. This paper extends previous work by demonstrating a sensitivity of the results to the methodology, time-scale and temperature dataset and the work is therefore suitable for publications. However, the primary result is that there is a lack of coherent relationship or consistency between cloud radiative effects and warming/cooling over interannual time-scales and so I consider it is misleading to argue prominently (in the abstract) that cloud feedback is negative and I consider that this should be revised accordingly. I also outline a number of specific suggestions and queries below.

C36

Specific comments:

- 1) Abstract, line 6 - the satellite data refers to CERES so it should be made clear that the all-sky fluxes are from the same data source as the present study.
- 2) Abstract, line 10 - the results do not strongly suggest that negative cloud feedback is likely so I would suggest removing "resulting in a likely negative feedback"; the author indeed notes in the abstract that "there is little correlation between the changes in the CRF and surface temperatures".
- 3) p.74, line 22: since this "net cooling effect of cloud" is sometimes confused in the popular literature for negative feedback I suggest making it clear here, perhaps adding something like: "(for example whether the cooling effect becomes stronger or weaker or even changes sign to a net heating effect as the climate warms)"
- 4) p.75, line 21-22: It is unclear why the CERES SSF product "... is more stable with respect to anomalies than its Energy Balanced and Filled (EBAF) counterpart" and a line of further explanation may be warranted
- 5) p.76, lines 21-25 - I found it unclear how the well documented clear-sky sampling bias (e.g. Cess and Potter 1987, Tellus) can affect changes in cloud radiative forcing unless the clear-sky regions behave differently to the cloudy regions in terms of water vapor responses. The satellite data only samples the rare clear-sky occurrence in cloudy regions and therefore estimates lower clear-sky OLR than model calculations or microwave-derived estimates. This will only impact changes in cloud radiative forcing if this bias changes. This is not obvious and indeed model calculations show that clear-sky sampling does not appear to affect interannual anomalies in clear-sky LW (e.g. Allan et al. 2003 Q. J. Royal Meteorol. Soc.). Additionally, there is also a SW sampling bias (Erlick and Ramaswamy, 2003 JGR) relating to aerosol.
- 6) p.78, line 14 "changes flux" → "changes in flux";
- 7) p.78, line 25: I was unsure where the 0.25 Wm⁻² adjustment came from. It is rea-

C37

sonable that greenhouse gas changes have increased radiative forcing by this amount over the period but what about other forcings (solar, volcanic, direct sulfate aerosols)? Will these introduce non-cloud effects on CRF? In fact, a recent paper by Kaufmann et al. (2011) PNAS, for example, shows little change in total radiative forcing since 2000.

8) p.80, line 4 - please explain how the 0.16 factor is applied

9) p.80, line 5 - there may also be other non-cloud SW effects such as small volcanic eruptions (Solomon et al. 2011 Science) and changes in aerosol emission (e.g. Kaufmann et al. 2011 PNAS). These are probably not represented in ERA Interim either but this caveat should also be mentioned.

10) p.81 - discussion: it is interesting that another analysis using AIRS and CERES data also finds a negative LW cloud feedback although this is balanced by positive SW cloud feedback so the overall implied cloud feedback is positive (Zelinka and Hartmann (2011) JGR); recent analysis of MISR data are also suggestive of a negative LW cloud radiative "feedback" due to a decline in cloud altitude since 2000 (Davies and Molloy, 2012 GRL) although this is predominantly manifest as a decline in cloud altitude during the 2008 La Nina cold event. It is of course important to stress that there is little physical evidence for feedback over this time-scale and changes in ocean temperature may be leading atmospheric response over some regions and cloud radiative effects altering ocean temperature over others (depending upon the depth of the mixed layer which varies strongly by region) (e.g. Dessler 2011 GRL; Spencer and Braswell, 2008; Lloyd et al. 2011 Clim Dyn).

Recent estimates of ocean heat content changes also seem to correspond with CERES measurements although there is a substantial observational uncertainty (Loeb et al. 2012 Nature Geosciences) and it is probably more likely that ocean changes are leading top of atmosphere flux changes over ENSO cycles as argued by Dessler (2011) GRL. Fast adjustments to forcings and regional changes in SST may be operating in addition to slower feedbacks in response to warming/cooling (e.g. Andrews et al. 2010

C38

GRL; Lloyd et al. 2011 Clim. Dyn) as alluded to in the text.

11) Figure 2 - it would be useful to show the time-series of surface temperature and also to include the HadCRUT and ERA Interim data dataset in the comparison to demonstrate the sensitivity to dataset used. The correspondence between clear-sky flux estimates (from CERES, ECMWF and AIRS) is remarkable. Does this indicate that the difference between CERES/ECMWF and CERES-only feedbacks originate mostly in the SW or are subtleties of the trends in clear-sky LW important?

12) Since the interannual relationships are being studied, rather than long-term feedbacks, it may be informative to de-trend the datasets. This would also remove any spurious long-term drifts.

13) The difference between Terra and Aqua periods are interesting and this should be mentioned explicitly. Does it suggest a problem with the early Terra/CERES record?

14) Table 1 - The comparison with Dessler (2010) is not clear since different surface temperature records are used. I suggest switching from NCDC to ERA Interim surface temperature as this will provide a consistent comparison with Dessler (2010) while also demonstrating any sensitivity to the dataset used (is ECMWF the same as ERA-Interim?).

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 3, 73, 2012.

C39