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Journal Article

Proceedings Paper
Publications Types

Journal Article

An academic or scholarly journal is a periodical publication in which a collection of academic papers is published.

Proceedings Paper

Proceedings or conference proceedings are a collection of academic papers published in the context of an academic conference or workshop.
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Abstract. A new snow melting parametrization is presented for the non-hydrostatic limited-area COSMO ("consortium for small-scale modeling") model. In contrast to the standard cloud microphysics of the COSMO model, which instantaneously transfers the meltwater from the snow to the rain category, the new scheme explicitly considers the liquid water fraction of the melting snowflakes. These semi-melted hydrometeors have characteristics (e.g., shape and fall speed) that differ from those of dry snow and rain droplets. Where possible, theoretical considerations and results from vertical wind tunnel laboratory experiments of melting snowflakes are used as the basis for characterizing the melting snow as a function of its liquid water fraction. These characteristics include the capacitance, the ventilation coefficient, and the terminal fall speed. For the bulk parametrization, a critical diameter is introduced. It is assumed that particles smaller than this diameter, which increases during the melting process, have completely melted, i.e., they are converted to the rain category. The values of the bulk integrals are calculated with a finite difference method and approximately represented by polynomial functions, which allows an efficient implementation of the parametrization. Two case studies of (wet) snowfall in Germany are presented to illustrate the potential of the new snow melting parametrization. It is shown that the new scheme (i) produces wet snow instead of rain in some regions with surface temperatures slightly above the freezing point, (ii) simulates realistic atmospheric melting layers with a gradual transition from dry snow to melting snow to rain, and (iii) leads to a slower snow melting process. In the future, it will be important to thoroughly validate the scheme, also with radar data and to further explore its potential for improved surface precipitation forecasts for various meteorological conditions.
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Received and published: 12 July 2013

The authors publish a new method about numerical simulation of melting of snowflakes. The scheme is implemented into the NWP model, COSMO. Most of the numerical models have been applied for operational weather forecast involve a simplified description of the melting. Immediate shedding of melted water from the surface of snow and graupel particles is supposed in these models. This idea does not agree with the laboratory observations, e.g. Mitra et al. 1990 proved that the melted liquid water accumulated on the snowflakes. The author’s numerical model corresponds with these observations. Following the result of Szymer and Zawadowsky (1999) they developed a new bulk scheme to simulate the melting of snowflakes. However, the author used the amount of melted water as a prognostic variable instead of the critical diameter was
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suggested by Szymer and Zavadsky (1999). I agree with this modification, because the mass is a conserved variable. Beside the detailed description of the model, the paper involves two hindcast studies. The comparison between the 'standard' and the new scheme shows, that the more sophisticated simulation of melting improves the forecast of mixed phase precipitation. After minor revisions the paper is worth to be published in Geoscientific Model Development. Major comments: (i) Fig 1a. shows the size dependence of the capacitance of dry and wet snow flakes. In my opinion the calculation of capacitance may be incorrect. Contrary to the plots in the figure the capacitance of the water drops should be the smallest (0.5*Dq), if the masses (or Deq) are the same. The physical base of this statement is: if masses are equal, the surface of a sphere is smaller than that of an oblate spheroid or that of a hexagonal plate. In my opinion the source of this problem is that the mass – size relation of m ~ D2 is used for the melted particles as well. The problem can be solved if both the exponent and the multiplication factor (α) are given as a function of the liquid water fraction.

(ii) If I understand well the snow means the sum of melted water and ice core in Fig 9b. I think it would be also interesting to plot a similar figure by taking into consideration the ice core only. Comparison this figure with Fig 9a would show how the application of new scheme affects the melting rate.

Minor comments: The colors of contours in Fig 5. do not agree with text in the figure caption.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 6, 2927, 2013.
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Review of "A bulk parameterization of melting snowflakes with explicit liquid water fraction for the COSMO model version 4.14" by C. Frick, A. Seifert and H. Wernli.

The paper describes a parameterization of melting snowflakes explicitly considering the liquid water fraction of the melting particles as a prognostic variable, building on earlier work by Mitra et al. (1990) and Szyrmer and Zawadzki (1999). The parameterization is described in detail and is followed by two case studies that show the impact of the model changes. The work addresses a difficult problem for NWP in determining precipitation type where near-surface temperature is slightly above zero. The paper is well written, describes a novel bulk parameterization implementation in an NWP model and is appropriate for publication in GMD. However, there are a couple of major com-
MAJOR COMMENTS

1. Calculation of capacitance

The authors have chosen to express the analysis in terms of the maximum geometrical dimension of the mass equivalent dry snowflake, D_s, assuming a density relation of m=0.069*D_s^2. Equally the authors could have chosen the diameter of the mass equivalent melted sphere, D_eq. The rationale would be the same, i.e. the diameter is constant following a particular particle throughout the melting process (as is the total mass of the particle). In contrast, the actual melted diameter would change (decrease) through the melting process due to increasing density, from the dry snowflake diameter, D_s, to the melted sphere diameter, D_eq.

The use of a constant diameter assumption (in this case D_s) has a number of consequences. Firstly, there is a discontinuity at the point where all snow has turned to rain, which the authors point out for the assumption of size distribution on p2939. Secondly, particle characteristics that depend on diameter, such as capacitance can be incorrectly calculated for melting particles if not carefully accounted for.

The capacitance is a term in the melting rate, and for a melting particle, is defined as a function of D_s and an increasing function of meltwater fraction, l, (Eqn 9) so for a melting particle with constant D_s, the capacitance increases with increasing meltwater fraction. Assuming constant density throughout the melting process D_eq is proportional to D_s^2/3, so the capacitance also increases with constant D_eq, which is plotted in Figure 1a. In fact, the capacitance should *decrease* as the particle melts due to an increase in the density and decrease in melted diameter. Eqn 9 should include a modification term for the particle density, which was taken into account in Mitra et al. (1990), but isn’t here. M90 assumed a linear increase in density from 0.02 for a dry snowflake to 1 for a raindrop (linear with melted water fraction). This will then
lead to a smooth transition to the capacitance of a raindrop.

The result of this change will be a lower melting rate as the melting proceeds, which will change the results in all subsequent simulations and figures.

2. Calculation of ventilation coefficient

For the ventilation coefficient, it is not clear how the Reynolds number is specified as a function of I. Do you use Eq 13 with interpolated terminal velocities between a dry snowflake and a rain drop calculated from Eq 11? A bit more detail would be appropriate. It is not so clear why there is so little dependence of the ventilation coefficient on equivalent diameter from rain to snow given the large change in terminal fall velocity - is this because the smaller melted drop size compensates exactly for the increased terminal fall speed? Figure 1(c) is very different to the equivalent plot in SZ99 (fig 2) which has the ventilation coefficient increasing significantly for increasing meltwater fraction. If there is a good reason for the differences, this should be explained.

[Note the empirical terminal fall velocity formulation in Fig 1(b) does look reasonable, and is consistent with SZ99 Fig 1. Might be a good idea to separate this section with sub-titles, i.e. a) Capacitance, b) Terminal fall speed c) Ventilation coefficient?]

MINOR COMMENTS AND GRAMMATICAL SUGGESTIONS

- Although I realise the model version "version 4.14" in the title has been requested by the journal, I don’t think it is necessary or appropriate in this case? The paper is not a description of this particular model, but rather a description of a parametrization that is more generally applicable.

- Abstract, p2928, line 12-13 I would suggest a slight reordering of the sentence to "For the bulk parameterization, a critical diameter is introduced which increases during the melting process. It is assumed that particles smaller than this diameter have completely melted..."
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Reply to Referee #2

Reviewer Comments are marked by RC and Author Reply by AR.

We thank anonymous referee #2 especially for the detailed comment on the capacitance of melting snowflakes. Consequently, we corrected our formulation of the

Thank you!
capacitance, leading to a modified melting integral and parametrization, and resimulated our case studies. A detailed description of the corrected calculation of the capacitance has been included in the paper and the new results (which are qualitatively very similar to the old ones) are presented.

Major Comments

1. **RC Calculation of capacitance**

   The authors have chosen to express the analysis in terms of the maximum geometrical dimension of the mass equivalent dry snowflake, $D_s$, assuming a density relation of $m = 0.069 \cdot D_s^2$. Equally the authors could have chosen the diameter of the mass equivalent melted sphere, $D_{eq}$. The rationale would be the same, i.e. the diameter is constant following a particular particle throughout the melting process (as is the total mass of the particle). In contrast, the actual melted diameter would change (decrease) through the melting process due to increasing density, from the dry snowflake diameter, $D_s$, to the melted sphere diameter, $D_{eq}$.

   The use of a constant diameter assumption (in this case $D_s$) has a number of consequences. Firstly, there is a discontinuity at the point where all snow has turned to rain, which the authors point out for the assumption of size distribution on p2939. Secondly, particle characteristics that depend on diameter, such as capacitance can be incorrectly calculated for melting particles if not carefully accounted for.

   The capacitance is a term in the melting rate, and for a melting particle, is defined as a function of $D_s$ and an increasing function of meltwater fraction, $l$, (Eqn 9) so for a melting particle with constant $D_s$, the capacitance increases with increasing meltwater fraction. Assuming constant density throughout the melting process $D_{eq}$ is proportional to $D_s^{2/3}$, so the
capacitance also increases with constant $D_{eq}$, which is plotted in Figure 1a. In fact, the capacitance should "decrease" as the particle melts due to an increase in the density and decrease in melted diameter. Eqn 9 should include a modification term for the particle density, which was taken into account in Mitra et al. (1990), but isn’t here. M90 assumed a linear increase in density from 0.02 for a dry snowflake to 1 for a raindrop (linear with melted water fraction). This will then lead to a smooth transition to the capacitance of a raindrop.

The result of this change will be a lower melting rate as the melting proceeds, which will change the results in all subsequent simulations and figures.

- **AR** We carefully had a look at our calculation of the capacitance and replaced the incorrectly applied diameter of the dry snowflake $D_s$ by the diameter of the melting snowflake $D_m$ as suggested by Mitra et al. (1990). A detailed description of the calculation has been added to the paper:

  "For the calculation of the capacitance M90 applied the approximation for an oblate spheroid. The axis ratio is assumed to be 0.3 for a dry dendritic crystal, and 1.0 for a raindrop. The axis ratio for melting snowflakes is approximated by a linear interpolation, i.e.,

  $$a(l) = 0.3 + 0.7 l. \quad (8)$$

  and the capacitance is then given by (Pruppacher and Klett, 1997, p. 547, Eq. (13-78)),

  $$C_m(D_s, l) = \alpha_{cap}(l) \frac{D_m(D_s, l)}{2} \frac{\sqrt{1-a(l)^2}}{\arcsin \sqrt{1-a(l)^2}} \quad (9)$$

  with $C_m(D_s, 0) = C_s$ and $C_m(D_s, 1) = C_r$. $D_m$ is the maximum dimension of the melting snowflake, which can be calculated as follows.
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