

## Reviewer 1

This article works to obtain the variability in particle dispersion based on Eulerian velocity data, by generating variability in single (one initial condition) trajectories by choosing ensembles whose initial conditions are (i) close to the initial condition, and (ii) at same location as the initial condition, but are at nearby times. Information-theoretical measures are used to quantify the variability of these simulations in the Gulf Stream region.

Being able to gain insights into variability and uncertainty of simulations based on Eulerian velocity data is an important issue. To my mind, the crucial thing here would be in the ability to parameterize the input uncertainties (in the measurements of the Eulerian velocity, in using various forms of diffusivity in the advection process, in interpolation methods used to estimate data at subgrid scales where no data is available, etc), as well as give careful assessments and/or sensitivity analyses of the other variables (time-of-flow, radii used for initial seeding, release date, etc) in the process. Any quantifier of Lagrangian dispersal uncertainty obtained will of course be strongly dependent on the quantifiers of, and the perspectives on modeling the impact of, these input uncertainties. My main comments below are related to this main theme, on which any conclusions obtained from this study are crucially dependent.

We thank the reviewer for recognizing the important issue underlying our work. We have below carefully addressed all the comments.

1. The authors use spatial radii ranging from 0.1 to 2 degrees (9 to 180 km) for their initial clouds of particles in the spatial uncertainty situation. They quote that computed average decorrelation lengthscale of 0.41 degrees. It's not clear to me how long the particles were advected -- one would of course expect nearby fluid parcels to spread-apart more and more as time progresses (reflected in Figure 4A, for example, where the entropy is used rather than decorrelation). To my mind, these decorrelation numbers are therefore not "useful." What is the connection to this time-of-flow, and how does this decorrelation change in relation to that? Is the fact that 0.41 degrees comparable in size to the 0.25 degree of resolution in the NATL025-CJMCYC3 model, i.e., that the Eulerian velocity is not resolved below this lengthscale, relevant? What is the physical motivation for using distances of 9-180 km to seed particles in assessing the dispersal over a certain time for a single initial condition? Not highlighting (I don't know whether it's buried somewhere and I couldn't find it) the time-of-flow is a serious limitation, because this will have a profound effect on any results obtained.

These are all good questions, that we now clarify in the revised manuscript. Specifically:

1. We have now clarified in the main text that we computed the decorrelation length scale *"of the initial particle velocities at the release location on the release day (2 January 2010)"* (lines 144-146 of the track-changed pdf). We used this to inform the size of the spatial release patches because it gives an estimate of the flow scales *at the moment of release*, so we think it is a relevant metric.

2. We moved the description of the correlation time and length scales to the methods section to improve readability (as suggested by reviewer 2; lines 155-166 and lines 186-200 of the track-changed pdf). We moved Figure A1 to main text, as Figure 2. We also added the equation that we used for calculating the decorrelation length and time scales (Eq.(1) and (2) of the track changes document).
3. We clarified that these metrics were computed as particle-pair correlations to inform the correlation in the spatial and temporal varying initial conditions used to generate variability (line 152 and 186, respectively, of the track-changed pdf). However, we explicitly state, lines 169-172: *"While decorrelation scales likely evolve over the 6-year simulation period due to particle spreading and varying flow conditions, computing their evolution at every particle age is computationally intensive and impractical, compared to other metrics."*
4. We have now clarified that the virtual particles were advected for six years (from 2 January 2010 to the end of the hydrodynamic data availability on 31 December 2015) – or slightly less in the case of the temporal varying release, where some particles were released up to 20 weeks later (lines 101 of the track-changed pdf). The time-of-flow is the same as the particle age that we use in e.g. Figures 3 and 4.
5. We also clarified in lines 139-141: *"The choice of spatial release radii (9-180 km) spans the range from sub-mesoscale to mesoscale oceanographic features, allowing us to test how initial condition uncertainties at different scales affect long-term particle dispersion."*

2. It seems that all calculations were done with 2 January as the release date. Given the unsteadiness (time-dependence) of the Eulerian velocity field, one will of course get different results if using a different release date. From an oceanographer's viewpoint, why is 2 January so important? Alternatively, there needs to be convincing results to show that "similar" results are obtained for different choices of release dates. Also, one needs some understanding of the sensitivity of the results of the time-of-flow chosen.

The reviewer has a good point that there is nothing 'special' with 2 January 2010. We chose it for the practical reason that it allowed us the longest particle advection time given the length of the CJMCYC3 model fields. However, since our goal was to introduce an analysis methodology, we feel that a full analysis of how the results change for different release dates is beyond scope (and computational resources available).

We have now clarified this in the limitations paragraph of the discussion section of the revised manuscript: *"We performed simulations for only one release period, on 2 January 2010, because that allowed us the longest particle advection time; but realise that there is nothing 'special' about that 2 January 2010 and that the results presented here might depend on the release time"* (lines 653-656 of the track-changed pdf).

3. For the temporally-varying release, the authors have used time windows of "4, 12 and 20 weeks, all starting from 2 January 2010." Once again, the time-of-flow is not clear, and it is moreover not clear whether the time-of-flow for each of these releases is the same. For example, if the time-of-flow was 2 weeks uniformly across all of these simulations, the "4 week time window" would, in my understanding correspond to having some particles released on 2 January and travelling until 16 January, but then also particles released on 30 January and travelling until 13 February. And presumably particles on intermediate days. All of this has to be made absolutely clear to enable any assessment of the results obtained. Moreover, as above, there needs to be some rationale for selecting these time windows.

Our advection strategy was apparently not clear in the first version of our manuscript. All particles travel until the end of 2015. We have now clarified in the methods section that "*all particles were advected until the end of 2015, so that in this simulation some particles reached a maximum 'age' (time-of-flow) of 6 years and others only 5.6 years. This is a minor effect though, as most of our analysis will focus on the first few months of advection only.*" (Lines 181-183 of the track-changed pdf).

4. If my above interpretation of the particle release is correct, I think there are some issues which interfere with the interpretation of this process giving an indicator of Lagrangian dispersal. Notice that in the example the particles travelling from 2 January to 16 January are driven by velocity field data which is *\*completely\** different from the particles released on 30 January and travelling to 13 February. From the dynamical systems perspective, this means that one is comparing things which are driven by completely different dynamical systems -- so what does the usage of these different final locations in a dispersal assessment actually mean? On the other hand, if the above interpretation is wrong, and there is some other way of thinking about this, what would the interpretation of that be? For example, if all particles are flowed till 13 February despite being released on different days, then again the dynamical systems are different, as is the time-of-flow (which strongly impacts correlation and any measure of dispersal). This sort of issue is relevant in the later calculations in the article as well, for example when computing time series of histograms described in Section 2.4---exactly how "time" is interpreted is crucial in an unsteady flow such as this.

As also mentioned in our previous response, we seem not to have been clear enough about our temporal release experiment strategy. The point of a temporally varying release is to seed particles that will have different trajectories, as the temporal decorrelation functions suggest. This is in fact the release strategy that is currently most widely used by Lagrangian ocean modellers to simulate different flow regimes, and the motivation of our study is to investigate how to assess whether this release strategy is equivalent to sampling different ensemble members. We have now further clarified this in the Introduction: "*Missing variability in particle trajectories is typically created by releasing particles at different locations (spatial variation; e.g., Rossi et al 2013) at different times (temporal variation; e.g., Qin et al 2014, van Sebille et al 2015) and/or with a small amount of random walk diffusion added to the advection (e.g., Hart-Davis and Backeberg 2021)*" (lines 64-70 of the track-changed pdf)

5. The authors say "to ensure particles released on the same day followed different trajectories, we added small random perturbations to their release locations using uniform noise with an amplitude of 0.1 degrees." Does this mean that one chooses uniformly from a ball of amplitude 0.1 degrees centered at the initial location? What this actually means is that both temporal and spatial variability in the initial condition is used here, and not just temporal variability, does it not?

Yes, the reviewer is correct that indeed we added a small amount of spatial variability in the temporal-variability runs. However, as we also explain in that paragraph "*we kept this noise amplitude small to (as much as possible) isolate the effects of the temporal release strategy alone*" (lines 179-180 of the track-changed manuscript).

6. Using temporal variability but from a set location is the concept of "streaklines" in fluid mechanics. This has seen importance in assessing transport due to Lagrangian motion principally when a streakline can sensibly be used as some sort of "barrier" between coherent structures, notably when the position from which the streakline emanates is fixed (on a boundary), for example see Haller (J Fluid Mech 2004), Zhang (SIAM Review, 2013), Karrasch (SIAM J Applied Dyn Sys, 2016), Balasuriya (SIAM J Applied Dyn Sys, 2017). For genuinely unsteady flows, since the velocity field around any fixed Eulerian location changes with time, the dispersal from a streakline approach (as the authors do here in their temporal release strategy) will provide a curve (a tube in this case since a small cloud is released at each time) at any given final instance in time -- but exactly how to interpret this tube from a Lagrangian dispersal perspective is unclear. It will consist of particles which have flowed for different times, and (for example) particles in a particular cross-section of the tube will not necessarily have flowed for the same time. If instead the interpretation I have in point 3 above is used, what this means is that a particular subsample of the points in this "streaktube" will be obtained for each day of release -- and how one uses the collection of these subsamples to quantify Lagrangian dispersal appears ambiguous.

This is an interesting perspective by the reviewer. We have now added this relation to streaklines in the introduction section, where we also cite the papers suggested by the reviewer: "*In fluid mechanics, this is related to the concept of streaklines, transport barriers and coherent structures (e.g., Haller 2004, Zhang 2013, Karrasch 2016, Balasuriya 2017)*" (lines 51-52 of the track-changed manuscript).

7. The authors do not seem to have used any randomness in the Lagrangian advection process (only randomness in initializing) which to my mind does not take into account fundamental contributors to Lagrangian dispersal in the ocean: effects of eddy diffusivity and uncertainties in the driving velocity fields. Eddy diffusivity modeling is a vast and important area (Berner et al, Bull Amer Meteorol Soc, 2017), for which many different models exist (e.g., Griffa, in Stochastic Modeling in Physical Oceanography, Birkhauser, 1996). Here, though, dispersal seems to

happen though the taking of nearby initial conditions both spatially and temporally. This seems artificial when there is a "natural" way of including the primary physical issues via advecting a stochastic differential equation model with small noise, or using the alternative representation via the Fokker-Planck equation (e.g., Chandrasekhar, Rev Modern Phys, 1943) which explicitly governs a probability density of particles, or using more sophisticated eddy diffusivity models. The results from the Fokker-Planck, for example, would be an explicit quantifier of Lagrangian dispersal. There is a substantial literature on these methods, also in usage in oceanic data. Of course, running stochastic simulations of this nature, or attempting to solve the Fokker-Planck may incur substantial computational costs, but these would seem more compelling approaches to Lagrangian dispersal.

The reviewer has a good point here. In the revised manuscript, we have also added the results of a simulation where the particle spread was created by adding a small amount of diffusion on top of the advection. We described the method to add diffusion in section 2.3.3 in the revised manuscript, in lines 203-217 in the track-changed manuscript. As well, we updated Figures 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 in the revised manuscript, to include the results from the added diffusion release strategy. As well, we updated the results section to include diffusivity (lines 397-399 and lines 514-519, of track-changed manuscript).

In the discussion section (lines 601-614 of the track-changed manuscript), we added: *"The added diffusion simulations use a stochastic differential equation approach with Brownian motion terms, following established methods in Lagrangian oceanography (Griffa, 1996). However, our results demonstrate that this approach has limitations in reproducing the full ensemble variability compared to spatial and temporal releases, particularly over particle ages < 100 days. We chose a physically reasonable diffusion coefficient based on literature values for subgrid-scale parameterization at our model resolution. Larger diffusivity coefficients could potentially increase trajectory variability, they would become unphysical as the artificial noise would exceed the magnitude of typical unresolved subgrid processes in the model, effectively forcing the particles to behave as if experiencing constant strong turbulent mixing. The underperformance of the diffusion strategy likely reflects that it represents primarily small-scale turbulent mixing processes, and the diffusivity cannot create noticeable variability in trajectories, specially for particle ages 100 days, missing the larger-scale flow uncertainties and mesoscale variability captured through other strategies."*

8. There are emerging tools for avoiding stochastic simulation and explicitly obtaining some quantifiers which are related to dispersal, in particular the idea of stochastic sensitivity (Balasuriya, SIAM Review, 2020) which has been shown to also be robust when applying to oceanographic data (Badza, Physica D, 2023). The authors' approach here of seeking dispersal measures for each initial condition (as opposed to a large ensemble) at first glance appears to be similar to finding the stochastic sensitivity (a scaled variance of the final distribution around the deterministic final location, when the Lagrangian evolution is subject on ongoing model noise) at each member (initial) location. Another approach along these lines which appears relevant is that of Branicki and Uda (SIAM J Appl Dyn Sys, 2023).

The reviewer raises an interesting point here; these approaches are indeed nicely complementary. Hence, we have now added a few sentences to the introduction of our revised manuscript: “*Our approach is complementary to other new approaches for computing stochastic sensitivity of Lagrangian trajectories in the ocean, such as those by Balasuriya (2020), Badza et al. (2023) and Branicki and Uda (2023). However, our approach is particularly also useful for particles with added ‘behaviour’, such as in the case of plastic particles (e.g., Denes and Van Sebille, 2024)*” (lines 73-76 of the track-changed pdf).

9. The authors use several quantifiers for dispersal based on their Lagrangian simulations: mixture probability distributions, connectivity, entropy, and KL-divergence. Computing each of these requires the final Lagrangian distributions. So, interpreting any of these depends strongly on how those Lagrangian distributions were obtained in a physically reasonable fashion (see my earlier points on this). Because of this, it is hard for me to interpret any of these information-theoretic results.

We agree with the reviewer that the fidelity of our results depends crucially on the details of the Lagrangian integration scheme. We expect that the changes we made in response to other comments already help to clarify our methodology, and to even further highlight where details on the trajectory computations can be found, we have restructured the Methods section so that there is now a separate section (2.2) “*Lagrangian simulations*” (line 101 of the track-changed pdf).

10. It appears that a major point that is being made is that the full-ensemble variability is being approximated by single-member simulations. This is stated in many places, but I am a little uncertain as to whether my interpretation of this statement is correct. My understanding is that “single-member” means one particular initial condition is chosen. By choosing “50 members” (line 158), Lagrangian simulations associated with 50 different initial conditions are chosen. Then the probability distributions associated with each of these 50 are combined in a mixture model to get the “full” distribution. Is this understanding correct? If so, it would appear that the “full ensemble” can be thought of as the 50 simulations collectively, and so this is collectively the “full ensemble”? If this is so, the claim that the “full-ensemble” is obtained from “single-member” simulations, presumably demonstrating some advantage, isn't too different from simply saying that one is choosing a full-ensemble comprising 50 members, presumably chosen to cover a region of interest at the initial time sufficiently well? If this is not true, things have not been expressed clearly. Basically, I think some clarification on this claim is necessary, explaining exactly what is meant and how it is achieved (and exactly what a “single-member simulation” means).

The reviewer is right that the term full-ensemble variability is somewhat unclear. In the revised manuscript, we have replaced it with “*variability of the full 50-member ensemble*” (lines 6 in the abstract) and “*Our goal is to reproduce this dispersion of what we refer to as the ‘full ensemble’ using just one ensemble member*” (lines 115 of the track-changed manuscript)

11. And finally to return to my preface to the numbered points: to interpret any of the results on dispersal, one needs to be comfortable that the strategies for computationally determining dispersal here have something to do with the physical issues which lead to dispersal. Many of the points above are related to this, asking for clarification as to why the actions used in this article to generate dispersed trajectories are meaningful, whether they can be parameterized in terms of something physical, effects of time, why diffusivity/stochasticity in the evolution is ignored, why other techniques which explicitly capture dispersion are not used, etc.

We agree with the reviewer that the fidelity of the results depend on the quality of the Lagrangian integration scheme and choice to include pure advection as well as stochastic approaches. We hope that our responses above have convinced the reviewer that this is the case. However, we would also like to highlight that our proposed analysis approach would have value by itself to other numerical oceanographers wanting to analyse their own ensemble simulations, for their own region of interest.

Based on my comments above, I feel that a major revision would be necessary for this article to be acceptable for publication in *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*.

We hope that our changes help convince the reviewer of the quality of our work, and thank them again for the very useful comments and ideas that have significantly improved our manuscript.