

Interactive comment on “Towards a public, standardized, diagnostic benchmarking system for land surface models” by G. Abramowitz

G. Abramowitz

gabsun@gmail.com

Received and published: 10 May 2012

I thank Referee 1 for a positive, constructive review and agree with most of the recommendations made. Below I deal with them in the order they are raised:

- I agree that Table 1 needs reworking to be clearer and more generalised, both with respect to column headings, caption and reference within the text. This was originally coloured table and apparently not all references to those colours were removed.
- I also agree that Item 3 on page 554 could be clearer and perhaps more succinct so that its context within this list is more apparent. I will endeavour to do this.
- I am obviously happy to amend any typographic errors.

- Regarding the presentation of figures: while I appreciate that text within the figures is a little small in the GMDD format, I believe that if these are two-column figures in a GMD article this will no longer be the case. These figures are taken, unedited, from the PALS system described in this paper. While I appreciate that the manuscript does not discuss all the detail included in the figures (e.g. justification of the naming conventions for benchmark variables or choices of scalar metrics), maintaining their original format is of considerable importance. Unless the editor feels strongly about this point, I would request to leave the figures as they are generated by the PALS system and instead expend some effort better clarifying their origin and context within the written text.

- Regarding the figure captions I personally prefer a paper that, where possible, makes the context of its figures clear in the captions. If the editor feels these captions are too long I am happy to revert to a "bare bones" description and leave a full explanation for the manuscript body. In most cases here though, since these figures contain a lot of detail, I feel their length is warranted.

- I am happy to rewrite the text on page 555 as suggested.

- In this context I am happy to amend the text in Table 2 from "Within observational uncertainty" to "Model output within observational uncertainty", as suggested.

- I will rewrite sections using "we" where its use is not appropriate for considering the author and reader together (e.g. where the author advances an opinion).

- I'm happy to give more context to the references to Oreskes and Medlyn papers.

- I will expand "ALMA" and provide a reference.

- I am happy to improve the fluency of the later parts on Section 4, as suggested.

- I will happily adopt this suggestion (regarding the placement of a comma) or indeed remove the comma from the sentence altogether.