

Interactive comment on “The low-resolution CCSM2 revisited: new adjustments and a present-day control run” by M. Prange

M. Prange

Received and published: 29 September 2006

I would like to thank referee #3 for his critical review and his constructive suggestions. The major concern of referee #3 is that the paper might be too technical for publication in OS. In my opinion, it is of utmost importance that the design of a climate model and its skills in simulating the present-day climatic state are described extensively in a way which is easy to access for the scientific community. This approach is crucial for maintaining a high level of transparency in science. Such papers provide the basis on which to judge the scientific output of a specific climate model. Since the low-resolution CCSM2 has already been applied in paleoclimatic studies (and more studies will follow) it is necessary to document the model and its performance in detail - as an integral part of the scientific process. Nevertheless, I fully agree with the referee that some scientific questions should be included into the paper to make it more interesting for a

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

wider audience. One important question which is raised by the referee is linked to the sinking branch of the Atlantic meridional overturning circulation at 40N (which is also seen in other CCSM versions). It would be particularly instructive to address this issue (along with the other questions raised by the referee) in a revised version of the paper.

Interactive comment on Ocean Sci. Discuss., 3, 1293, 2006.

OSD

3, S525–S526, 2006

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper