

Interactive comment on “Incorporation of the C-GOLDSTEIN efficient climate model into the GENIE framework: the “genie_eb_go_gs” configuration of GENIE” by R. Marsh et al.

D. Lunt

d.j.lunt@bristol.ac.uk

Received and published: 28 January 2009

This is just a clarification of the role of GMD (as I see it, others may disagree!), and how this relates to this particular paper.

One of the principal aims of GMD is to allow the peer-reviewed publication of model descriptions, and evaluation of models compared to observational data or analytic solutions. As such, many papers which eventually appear in GMD will not address or solve outstanding scientific issues, or reach profound conclusions. They will instead provide a 'benchmark' for other papers in other journals which will typically apply the model to scientific questions.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



This is laid out clearly in the 'Aims and Scope' on the GMD homepage
<http://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/index.html>
, and in the Manuscript Evaluation Criteria
http://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/review/ms_evaluation_criteria.html.

However, in this case there has been some confusion because the (automatic) email sent out to the reviewers of all GMDD papers lays down different (and inappropriate) evaluation criteria. As the reviewer points out, these include (among others) :

- Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?
- Are substantial conclusions reached?

The reviewer is the first person to spot this inconsistency - so many thanks! I apologise to the reviewer for the fact that they have been given misleading instructions, and also apologise to the author and the editor.

The automated email to reviewers has now been updated to match more closely the stated Manuscript evaluation Criteria, and reviewers of future GMD papers should receive better instructions.

Dan Lunt
Executive Editor, GMD

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 2, 1, 2009.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

