

Open comment on wcd-2022-47:
Some concerns regarding the methodology and interpretation of a
valuable study on Agulhas Current influence on South African
precipitation.

Stefaan Conradie

October 18, 2022

This is an important article on an understudied subject. I would strongly support the publication of a paper focussed on the evidence of influence of Agulhas Current changes on southern African precipitation from the high resolution model experiments described in this work. The comments provided herein are not intended as a complete evaluation of the submitted work. They focus primarily on claims made relating to my area of expertise. In particular, I have some significant concerns regarding the framing of the study, observational data used and representation and interpretation of some results, namely:

1. I would argue that the claims regarding recent WRZ rainfall trends made in the introduction (lines 31–33) are unclear, misleading and not well substantiated. Since this relates to relatively central conclusions of the study, a correction is required. More specifically:
 - (a) [Roffe et al. \(2021\)](#) is cited to suggest a trend towards decreasing rainfall in recent decades over the WRZ using station data, whereas [Roffe et al. \(2021\)](#) do not conduct rainfall trend analysis at all, as far as I can tell. Many recent WRZ station rainfall trend assessments have been conducted, such as in [Burls et al. \(2019\)](#), [Roffe et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Mahlalela et al. \(2019\)](#).
 - (b) [MacKellar et al. \(2014\)](#) is cited to support the assertion that “gridded observational data sets and reanalysis data indicate an increase ... [in] precipitation in the WRZ”, as opposed to the decrease found by [Wolski et al. \(2020\)](#) with station data. However, [MacKellar et al. \(2014\)](#) also use station-based rainfall data and not, as far as I can tell, gridded observations. Furthermore, for the period 1960–2010 considered by [MacKellar et al. \(2014\)](#), significant rainfall trends are found at only one station in the WRZ; trends at all other stations are insignificant and small in magnitude. This is entirely consistent with 50-year SW cluster trends centred on 1985 depicted in [Wolski et al. \(2020, Fig 4\)](#).
 - (c) My reading of the maps in [Onyutha \(2018\)](#) also indicate negative rainfall trends over the WRZ over 1990–2015.
 - (d) Considering all studies I’m aware of that analyse recent rainfall trends over the WRZ (in addition to those previously listed: [Ndebele et al., 2019](#); [Du Plessis and Schloms, 2017](#); [Hoffman et al., 2011](#); [Kruger and Nxumalo, 2017](#); [Otto et al., 2018](#); [Seager et al., 2019](#); [Pascale et al., 2020](#); [Deitch et al., 2017](#); [Conradie et al., 2022b](#); [Zscheischler and Lehner, 2022](#)), both station data and gridded gauge-based datasets indicate satellite-era drying, particularly since the 1990s. The primary disagreements between studies are because of either:
 - i. differences in the time period or spatial domain considered (as noted in the conclusion); or
 - ii. because the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) gridded rainfall dataset exhibits a growing negative rainfall bias after 2000, associated with a loss of data availability from wet reporting gauges [Wolski et al. \(2020\)](#).

- (e) Hence, any statement about existing evidence on rainfall trends over the WRZ should rather focus on the general agreement of data sources regarding drying in recent decades, but perhaps note that the results are sensitive to spatial and temporal bounds used.
2. As noted by the first reviewer, the GPCP data (the version and a download link should be provided) used in this study covers too short a period to conduct robust trend analysis, especially given the well-established low-frequency variability in the WRZ, YRZ and SRZ (e.g. [Dieppois et al., 2016](#)). The short period of data coverage appears to be the result of the authors choosing to use daily rainfall data for these analyses, but it is not clear why daily data are required. Monthly GPCP data admittedly have a very coarse resolution, but the higher resolution daily data presented do not appear to accurately capture regions with large climatological rainfall gradients (see point 3 below). In addition, as far as I am aware, GPCP has not previously been used to study rainfall variability or change over the southern or western parts of southern Africa, where, as the authors note, the mechanisms driving rainfall occurrence and variability are different to the rest of southern Africa. Given that the authors pay considerable attention to rainfall changes over the WRZ during winter, validation should include comparison with a dataset that has previously been used over this region (and not CRU, given the biases pointed out previously), or whose regional veracity is demonstrated. GPCC data are available over a long period, at a much higher resolution and have been demonstrated to exhibit climatology, seasonality and variability characteristics deviating little from gauge-based observations ([Wolski et al., 2020](#)), so would seem an obvious choice. However, there may be reasons why other datasets are preferable in other parts of the domain, so the authors should of course use their discretion in selecting the most appropriate observations for their purposes.
 3. The WRZ is mischaracterised in section 3, specifically in lines 126–129 and 138–140 and Figures 2 and 3. Specifically:
 - As far as I can tell, the bounds used for the WRZ domain in figures and analysis are not stated anywhere, nor is justification provided for the domain choice. It appears that an area that extends too far to the north-east has been selected, thus including places that receive very little rainfall, with all-year or late summer rainfall seasonality (cf. [Roffe et al., 2019](#); [Conradie et al., 2022a](#)). This is reflected in the WRZ rainfall seasonality plots in Fig. 3, where the JRA-55 WRZ curve shows a secondary rainfall peak in March, suggestive of a late summer rainfall influence, whereas the GPCP data have an absolute minimum in September, suggestive of an interior YRZ seasonality. Furthermore, the amplitude of the seasonality in all datasets are much lower and the total annual rainfall much lower than most studies of the WRZ tend to find.
 - In the text the WRZ is equated to the “Western Cape region”, despite the WRZ covering less than half the Western Cape provincial area and extending beyond its borders. Without a specific definition, the “Western Cape region” is likely to be assumed by readers to correspond approximately to the South African province by that name. Furthermore, the WRZ is described as a “dryer region”. Whereas some of the driest recording gauges in South Africa are located in the WRZ, the wettest recording gauge in the country is also situated in the WRZ and there are multiple gauges in the domain recording in excess of 1500mm per annum on average ([Lynch, 2004](#); [Slingsby et al., 2021](#)). The South-Western Cape, as generally conceived, is certainly not a uniformly dry area, as appears to be suggested.
 - Furthermore, the relatively coarse resolution GPCP data do not adequately capture the regions of high ($> 3\text{mm/day}$ from other datasets) rainfall in the south-west, the Drakensberg or eastern Madagascar (Fig. 2 and 3). CCLM appears to do better over the Maloti-Drakensberg of Lesotho than the reference data.
 - The fact that absolute scales are used in all panels of Fig. 2 and that the area on which most of the paper focuses on is dry relative to the Congo Basin and northern Madagascar means that the relative amplitude of the CCLM biases relative to GPCP are difficult to ascertain. In understanding trend and variability influence, relative bias is at least as important to assess as absolute biases.

- No mention appears to be made of the fact that the amplitude of the WRZ seasonal cycle is about 2x larger in the hindcast simulation than the historical simulation.

I therefore cannot concur with the authors that they demonstrate that “CCLM represents well the annual cycle of both rainfall regions SRZ and WRZ”; that “precipitation is generally realistically represented in the southern part of [their] domain”; or that “larger biases are mainly out of [their] focus region”.

- Whereas it is noted in the work that the YRZ occurs along the South Coast, it is not clear why in the analysis only the WRZ is distinguished from the rest of the domain, which appears to be collectively considered as the SRZ. In addition, very wet areas near the Equator apparently included in the SRZ have a very different precipitation seasonality to those areas south of roughly 15°S. Whereas the text notes that these areas are not the focus of the study, why are these regions then used as part of the aggregation domain in Fig. 3? Or if they aren’t, what domain bounds are applied for Fig. 3?
- The purpose of section 4 in the study is not clear. The questions posed at the beginning of the section are not clearly answered, nor are they clearly related to the overall aims of the study. Figures 4 and 5 compare trends over very different time periods, meaning that results are not really directly comparable. This is noted in the text, but the comparisons are interpreted nonetheless. In addition, these figures do not indicate statistical significance or compare the magnitude of trends to interannual variability or climatology for the seasons, making assessment of their practical significance difficult. The JRA-55 trends also seems suspiciously large over the centre of the domain; there isn’t perhaps a scaling error here? The statements in the text regarding the significance of JJA WRZ rainfall trends are not clear and do not appear consistent with the figures; Figure 5(d) for the historical simulation strongly suggests negative trends.
- Regarding section 5:
 - How can SST trends be directly and separately attributed to Agulhas Current or Agulhas Leakage volumes using a simple univariate linear least-squares regression model when the two variables appear to co-vary significantly and apparently are both associated significantly with anthropogenic warming? Surely the method may merely be detecting changes or variability associated with a covariate? This is indirectly acknowledged in lines 249–250: “the SST trends in the North Benguela Upwelling System are probably not directly impacted by the Agulhas Current, but rather climate change impacts both the Agulhas Current and the SSTs”. But it is not clear then how the conclusion can be drawn in line 251 that “the Agulhas Current and the Agulhas leakage contribute to the warming trend of SSTs adjacent to southern Africa.” Perhaps the framing of this section needs to be looked at?
 - Again the significance of correlations are not mentioned or displayed in most cases, making assessment of the robustness of results difficult.
 - Furthermore, the statement in lines 247–248 that “the strong SST trend in the Cape basin is possibly more linked to the Agulhas leakage” needs to be substantiated.
 - In Fig. 9, are annual totals being considered here? And if so, why, when previously seasonal precipitation had been assessed?
 - Lines 272–273: “The change in the dependency of Agulhas leakage strength on precipitation from the past to the future requires further investigation.” Surely this is the incorrect direction of implied dependence?
- Parts of the discussion in the conclusion seem like they would be better suited to the introduction or results sections. The statement: “Dosio et al. (2021b) found a good agreement of JRA-55 to other observational data sets for precipitation (1979-2018) and show generally comparable precipitation seasonal means in observational data sets for southern Africa” should not be in the conclusion, but rather should inform assessment in section 3 of the implications of the comparisons conducted. At

the scale that results are reported and conclusions drawn in this work (e.g. the south-east coast of South Africa, the South African South Coast or the WRZ), the cited paper does not appear to provide support for this claim, however.

More minor concerns are:

1. The statement on line 1–2; “It defines the seasons and it directly impacts one of the principal sources of income, agriculture” should be substantiated with a citation. It is also not clear what is meant by rainfall “defin[ing] the seasons”.
2. It should be clarified in lines 16–18 that the far south-west (the WRZ) is unique in that *most of the annual precipitation* here occurs during the winter season; the all-year or year-round rainfall zone (YRZ), as noted in line 130, also receives significant rainfall contributions during winter, as do some other parts of the east coast (see, for example, papers reviewed by [Roffe et al. \(2019\)](#)). Also, while frontal rainfall contributes $\approx 90\%$ of winter rainfall in the core of the WRZ ([Burls et al., 2019](#)), it is not accurate to imply this is the only source of rainfall in the WRZ (see, e.g., [Abba Omar and Abiodun \(2020\)](#)).
3. As noted by the first anonymous reviewer, [Jury \(2020\)](#) and [Jury \(2015\)](#) are relevant to the discussion of rainfall and the Agulhas Current.
4. The motivating paragraph, lines 41–43, makes claims that probably require further substantiation and clarification.
5. Line 65: “Therefore, there is probably a large-scale common mechanism related to the increased radiative forcing that is behind this large-scale spatial pattern of precipitation reduction, and which is independent of changes in the Agulhas Current System.” This mechanism has been widely studied by, for example, [Seager et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Polade et al. \(2017\)](#).
6. Line 81: The “broader scope” of this study should be more precisely detailed here.
7. Lines 128–131: The division of South Africa into 8 rainfall zones by the South African Weather Service in 1972 ([Rouault and Richard, 2004](#)) is only one of a range of subdivisions that have been proposed. The sentence should be rephrased to indicate this.
8. Variables in equations should be denoted by a single character or symbol (with sub- and/or superscripts as necessary), not multi-character strings, to avoid ambiguity (e.g. is $AL(t)$ a single function or is it $A(t) \times L(t)$?), as is standard practise in all physical sciences (see, e.g., IUPAC guidelines linked to on the Copernicus manuscript preparation page). Where words are used in subscripts they should not be italicised.
9. The “wetting” referred to in line 163 appears to be focussed in the western interior, not west coast.
10. Line 169: “The hindcast simulation and JRA-55 agree that precipitation in the WRZ has increased in the past.” The figure depicts this for the JJA season only; it probably does not apply in the annual total due to reductions in the shoulder seasons seen in most datasets.
11. Line 183: “is linked to” should perhaps be “may be linked to”, unless the authors demonstrate the nature of the link.
12. Line 288–289: Citation suggested.

References

- Abba Omar, S. and Abiodun, B. J.: Characteristics of cut-off lows during the 2015–2017 drought in the Western Cape, South Africa, *Atmos. Res.*, 235, 104 772, doi:[10.1016/j.atmosres.2019.104772](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosres.2019.104772), 2020.
- Burls, N. J., Blamey, R. C., Cash, B. A., Swenson, E. T., al Fahad, A., Bopape, M.-J. M., Straus, D. M., and Reason, C. J. C.: The Cape Town “Day Zero” drought and Hadley cell expansion, *npj Climate and Atmospheric Science*, 2, 27, doi:[10.1038/s41612-019-0084-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41612-019-0084-6), 2019.
- Conradie, W. S., Wolski, P., and Hewitson, B. C.: Spatial heterogeneity in rain-bearing winds, seasonality and rainfall variability in southern Africa’s winter rainfall zone, *Advances in Statistical Climatology, Meteorology and Oceanography*, 8, 31–62, doi:[10.5194/ascmo-8-31-2022](https://doi.org/10.5194/ascmo-8-31-2022), 2022a.
- Conradie, W. S., Wolski, P., and Hewitson, B. C.: Spatial heterogeneity of 2015–2017 drought intensity in South Africa’s winter rainfall zone, *Advances in Statistical Climatology, Meteorology and Oceanography*, 8, 63–81, doi:[10.5194/ascmo-8-63-2022](https://doi.org/10.5194/ascmo-8-63-2022), 2022b.
- Deitch, M., Sapundjieff, M., and Feirer, S.: Characterizing Precipitation Variability and Trends in the World’s Mediterranean-Climate Areas, *Water*, 9, 259, doi:[10.3390/w9040259](https://doi.org/10.3390/w9040259), 2017.
- Dieppois, B., Pohl, B., Rouault, M., New, M., Lawler, D., and Keenlyside, N. S.: Interannual to inter-decadal variability of winter and summer southern African rainfall, and their teleconnections, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres*, 121, 6215–6239, doi:[10.1016/j.egypro.2016.11.209](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2016.11.209), 2016.
- Du Plessis, J. and Schloms, B.: An investigation into the evidence of seasonal rainfall pattern shifts in the Western Cape, South Africa, *J. S. Afr. Inst. Civ. Eng.*, 59, 47–55, doi:[10.17159/2309-8775/2017/v59n4a5](https://doi.org/10.17159/2309-8775/2017/v59n4a5), 2017.
- Hoffman, M. T., Cramer, M. D., Gillson, L., and Wallace, M.: Pan evaporation and wind run decline in the Cape Floristic Region of South Africa (1974–2005): Implications for vegetation responses to climate change, *Clim. Change*, 109, 437–452, doi:[10.1007/s10584-011-0030-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-011-0030-z), 2011.
- Jury, M. R.: Passive Suppression of South African Rainfall by the Agulhas Current, *Earth Interactions*, 19, 1–14, doi:[10.1175/EL-D-15-0017.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/EL-D-15-0017.1), 2015.
- Jury, M. R.: Marine climate change over the eastern Agulhas Bank of South Africa, *Ocean Science*, 16, 1529–1544, doi:[10.5194/OS-16-1529-2020](https://doi.org/10.5194/OS-16-1529-2020), 2020.
- Kruger, A. C. and Nxumalo, M. P.: Historical rainfall trends in South Africa: 1921 – 2015, *Water SA*, 43, 285–297, doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/wsa.v43i1.12>, 2017.
- Lynch, S. D.: Development of a raster database of annual, monthly and daily rainfall for Southern Africa: Report to the water research commission, Tech. Rep. WRC Report 1156/1/04, Water Research Commission, Pretoria, South Africa, 2004.
- MacKellar, N., New, M., and Jack, C.: Observed and modelled trends in rainfall and temperature for South Africa: 1960–2010, *S Afr J Sci*, 110, doi:[10.1590/sajs.2014/20130353](https://doi.org/10.1590/sajs.2014/20130353), 2014.
- Mahlalela, P. T., Blamey, R. C., and Reason, C. J. C.: Mechanisms behind early winter rainfall variability in the southwestern Cape, South Africa, *Clim. Dyn.*, 53, 21–39, doi:[10.1007/s00382-018-4571-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-018-4571-y), 2019.
- Ndebele, N. E., Grab, S., and Turasie, A.: Characterizing rainfall in the south-western Cape, South Africa: 1841–2016, *Int. J. Climatol.*, p. joc.6314, doi:[10.1002/joc.6314](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6314), 2019.
- Onyutha, C.: Trends and variability in African long-term precipitation, *Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment*, 32, 2721–2739, doi:[10.1007/S00477-018-1587-0/FIGURES/8](https://doi.org/10.1007/S00477-018-1587-0/FIGURES/8), 2018.

- Otto, F. E. L., Wolski, P., Lehner, F., Tebaldi, C., Van Oldenborgh, J., Hogesteegeer, S., Singh, R., Holden, P., Fućkar, N. S., Odoulami, R. C., and New, M.: Environmental Research Letters Anthropogenic influence on the drivers of the Western Cape drought 2015-2017 Anthropogenic influence on the drivers of the Western Cape drought 2015-2017, *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 13, 124010, doi:[10.1088/1748-9326/aae9f9](https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aae9f9), 2018.
- Pascale, S., Kapnick, S. B., Delworth, T. L., and Cooke, W. F.: Increasing risk of another Cape Town “Day Zero” drought in the 21st century, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, p. 202009144, doi:[10.1073/pnas.2009144117](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2009144117), 2020.
- Polade, S. D., Gershunov, A., Cayan, D. R., Dettinger, M. D., and Pierce, D. W.: Precipitation in a warming world: Assessing projected hydro-climate changes in California and other Mediterranean climate regions, *Sci. Rep.*, 7, 1–10, doi:[10.1038/s41598-017-11285-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-11285-y), 2017.
- Roffe, S. J., Fitchett, J. M., and Curtis, C. J.: Classifying and mapping rainfall seasonality in South Africa: a review, *S Afr Geogr J*, 101, 158–174, doi:[10.1080/03736245.2019.1573151](https://doi.org/10.1080/03736245.2019.1573151), 2019.
- Roffe, S. J., Fitchett, J. M., and Curtis, C. J.: Quantifying rainfall seasonality across South Africa on the basis of the relationship between rainfall and temperature, *Climate Dynamics*, 56, 2431–2450, doi:[10.1007/s00382-020-05597-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-020-05597-5), 2021.
- Roffe, S. J., Steinkopf, J., and Fitchett, J. M.: South African winter rainfall zone shifts: A comparison of seasonality metrics for Cape Town from 1841–1899 and 1933–2020, *Theoretical and Applied Climatology*, pp. 1–19, doi:[10.1007/s00704-021-03911-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00704-021-03911-7), 2022.
- Rouault, M. and Richard, Y.: Intensity and spatial extension of drought in South Africa at different time scales, *Water SA*, 29, 489–500, doi:[10.4314/wsa.v29i4.5057](https://doi.org/10.4314/wsa.v29i4.5057), 2004.
- Seager, R., Osborn, T. J., Kushnir, Y., Simpson, I. R., Nakamura, J., and Liu, H.: Climate variability and change of mediterranean-type climates, *J. Clim.*, 32, 2887–2915, doi:[10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0472.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-18-0472.1), 2019.
- Slingsby, J. A., Buys, A., Simmers, A. D. A., Prinsloo, E., Forsyth, G. G., Glenday, J., and Allsopp, N.: Jonkershoek: Africa’s oldest catchment experiment - 80 years and counting, *Hydrol. Process.*, doi:[10.1002/hyp.14101](https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.14101), 2021.
- Wolski, P., Conradie, S., Jack, C., and Tadross, M.: Spatio-temporal patterns of rainfall trends and the 2015–2017 drought over the winter rainfall region of South Africa, *Int. J. Climatol.*, p. joc.6768, doi:[10.1002/joc.6768](https://doi.org/10.1002/joc.6768), 2020.
- Zscheischler, J. and Lehner, F.: Attributing Compound Events to Anthropogenic Climate Change, *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, 103, E936–E953, doi:[10.1175/BAMS-D-21-0116.1](https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-21-0116.1), 2022.