

Interactive comment on “Water transport among the world ocean basins within the water cycle” by David García-García et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 8 August 2020

Overall this is an excellent manuscript, presenting a new result about the Earth's ocean-land-atmosphere mass exchange, using a unique combination of satellite and reanalysis datasets, and a clear easy-to-follow methodology.

The only major concern/question I have is this: the interbasin ocean transport N is a small residual of differencing large numbers. I see that each set of numbers is followed by a 95% confidence range, and I read without quite understanding that the confidence interval is computed by a bootstrap method on the data itself. I don't believe the reanalysis data have their own error estimates; I believe the GRACE data do but those did not seem to be used in the confidence interval estimation. I wonder whether estimating uncertainties in the transports by propagating uncertainties in the inputs would give intervals consistent with those of the bootstrap method. Upper bounds on the

C1

uncertainties in the inputs can be estimated, for example, by comparing UT-CSR mascons to JPL or GSFC mascons, by comparing ECMWF reanalysis to NCEP or another model's reanalyses, etc. I say this because the lack of correlation between the inter-annual transports and ANY index of ocean-atmosphere interaction (ENSO, SOI, etc) is suspicious.

Now addressing some details: Figure 1: I would have liked to see a row with P-E-R next to the row for dW in Figure 1. Figures 1 and 3: I am sure the authors know better smoothers than the running mean (Hanning, Kaiser, etc). I recommend they use one. Line 27: Clark reference missing. Recheck all your references, I did not do an exhaustive check. Line 93: tectonic signals in the gravity field do not 'masquerade as mascons'. Mascons are a simple mathematical representation of the gravity field with a physical interpretation. Tectonics "would be incorrectly interpreted as water mass flux" Lines 124 et seq: see my concern above. A physical interpretation of this mathematical approach to confidence intervals would be useful. Line 164: and loses 'to the atmosphere' 879 Gt/month. . . Line 188: I think 'The Atlantic/Arctic inflow 'mirrors this behaviour' is a better phrase in English. Somewhere: W. T. Liu et al (GRL 2006, on South American water balance) did a similar estimation of water flux between an ocean basin and the land, without using any numerical model data. There are a few more minor language errors (lines 255, 267 and possibly others). Please go over the manuscript and clean up.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-2020-54>, 2020.

C2