

Interactive
Comment

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

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 11 October 2006

Review of "The low-resolution CCSM2 revisited: new adjustments and a present-day control run" by M. Prange

The paper describes tuning and a control run of a version of the NCAR coupled climate model. It is highly technical and does not address any particular scientific question. It is well written and presented but I found the paper hard to read because of the lack of motivation caused by the missing scientific question. It has the character of a technical report and I am not sure if such a paper is suitable for the journal. I leave this decision to the editor. The paper is also quite long because all kinds of different aspects of the model performance are discussed. This could also be seen more positively as a general analysis of the model performance. I am not familiar with the NCAR models and thus I don't know how much of this is already described elsewhere. Maybe the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

paper could be radically shortened and reduced to those aspects of the model that were actually changed (like the MOC and some related variables).

I also agree with one of the other reviewers that the flux adjustment is problematic. First of all it seems to be very large (50% of the freshwater flux into the Arctic). In case the author makes revisions I suggest to include information on the integrated freshwater adjustment amount in Sverdrups. Anyway, this large an adjustment means there is something wrong with the model that needs to be fixed.

I also don't see much of a point in a 20% increase in model speed.

I guess the main purpose of this paper is to provide a reference for current or future users of this particular model version, but this might as well be done in the form of a technical report.

In response to one of the other reviewers the author uses previous applications of this model as a reason for publication of this paper as a necessary in depth description. I do not agree that previously published papers alone warrant publication of a model description paper.

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper