

Interactive comment on “Global warming projections derived from an observation-based minimal model” by K. Rypdal

dr. Rypdal

kristoffer.rypdal@uit.no

Received and published: 13 November 2015

Reply to referee #1

Thanks for a positive and constructive review.

Referee: Abstract: Replace “Main value” by “highlights”.

Response: Good suggestion. Will be done.

Referee: Replace “the broad community of scientists” by “the scientific community.”

Response: “scientific community” could be interpreted as “the climate science community,” so that does not cover what I want to say. I can change it to “scientific community at large,” although I cannot really see what was wrong with the original phrase.

C802

Referee: Replace “. . . main driver of dangerous” by “main driver for.”

Response: There are two issues here. The use of the qualifier “dangerous” (global change). I can replace this by: “a main driver of global warming over the last century.” The preposition “of ” is correct here, “for” is not.

Referee: “The unconvincing part is the above mentioned reliance on complex computer models.” – is the author suggesting the reliance on ESMs is not necessary at all?

Response: First, I am not suggesting anything. I refer to views of “many physical scientists.” This sentence should not be read in isolation. In the full context it should be clear that it is EXCESSIVE reliance on ESMs that is perceived as unconvincing. I will add the qualifier “excessive.”

Referee: Remove “And” at the start of sentence.

Response: OK.

Referee: “meaningless acronyms”

Response: I replace this by “acronyms that carry no meaning to non-experts.”

Referee: The phrase: “. . . why do think these horrendously complex models perform any better.”

Response: Again, this is not my argument or opinion. I am just referring to comments I get from my former plasma physics colleagues, and these are formulated just like this. It is not my task to brush them up to make them look more reasonable.

Referee wants to remove the phrase where I claim that the present work is more “transparent” than the paper by Stocker.

Response: I don’t agree. A major motivation for this work is to use an approach that is more transparent in the sense that all assumptions are open to inspection to the reader. An approach that is based on empirical results from a large ensemble of ESMs

C803

lacks this type of transparency.

Referee: Use of the first person singular "I."

Response: In a paper I published in JGR-Atmospheres in 2012 I used the first person plural "we." Here one referee instructed me to drop "the Royal we" and use "I." The option which is left is to drop first person entirely, and use passive form everywhere. This inevitably leads to a very stiff style, which may be the desired norm of scientific writing in some languages, but not in English. I shall go through the paper to see if first person singular can be naturally be avoided in some places.

Referee: Elaborate the conclusions.

Response: That seems like a good suggestion, and I will do that.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 6, 1789, 2015.