



***Interactive comment on “The Met Office Unified
Model Global Atmosphere 3.0/3.1 and JULES
Global Land 3.0/3.1 configurations” by
D. N. Walters et al.***

J. C. Hargreaves (Editor)

jules@jamstec.go.jp

Received and published: 30 August 2011

Please submit a revised manuscript, taking into account the comments of the reviewers.

In regard to this comment by the second reviewer, "There is, in fact, very little science content in the manuscript, which make it less valuable than it could, possibly because: a) the objective seems to be mainly one of documenting the model formulation, to be referenced by future papers, leaving very little space at the end for results.", note that while new scientific results about the real world should not be included in A GMD manuscript, verification and validation are encouraged.

C599

From the Manuscript Types webpage at GMD, describing Model Description Papers: "Examples of model output should be provided, with comparison to standard benchmarks, observations and/or other model output included as appropriate. In this, authors are expected to distinguish between verification (checking that the chosen equations are solved correctly) and validation (assessing whether the model is a good representation of the real system)."

The verification and validation sections should not, however, overwhelm a model description. Such work would be better presented as a separate model evaluation paper.

Another quote from the Manuscript Types page: "Model evaluation papers typically comprise a more in-depth evaluation of an already-published numerical model than would be possible in a model description paper. Authors may address aspects of verification and/or validation, but should aim to maintain the broadest relevance in the tests employed: i.e. the validation/verification should be valid for a large a range of model parameters/scenarios as possible."

Taking into account the above the authors may reconsider the appropriate balance of description and model results. Personally I think the balance is good, but, of course, more in depth verification/validation may be included if it is beneficial to the paper as a whole.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 4, 1213, 2011.