



Interactive comment on “The hybrid Eulerian Lagrangian numerical scheme tested with Chemistry” by A. B. Hansen et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 14 March 2013

I find it difficult to review the paper. In particular, the description of chemistry in Section 3 is way too short to know how it has been implemented. Since chemistry appears to be a critical aspect of the paper, the authors should be asked to provide a more detailed description.

Also, I find the number of figures excessive and their quality insufficient. For example, it is very hard to distinguish different panels in Figs. 1, 2, 4, and 6. The authors should be encouraged to reduce the number of figures and discuss their salient features, not just numbers. E.g., what are the implications of differences in I1, I2, and I?

There is an excessive reliance on the authors' unpublished work (Kaas et 2012) with no attempt to place the work in the context of the current state-of-the-science regarding advection schemes.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 5, 3695, 2012.

GMDD

5, C1539–C1540, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1540

