

Interactive comment on “Assessing climate model software quality: a defect density analysis of three models” by J. Pipitone and S. Easterbrook

J. Pipitone and S. Easterbrook

jon.pipitone@utoronto.ca

Received and published: 11 May 2012

We thank the reviewers for their generous comments on the paper.

Tom Clune, in his review, points out a potential sixth hypothesis to explain our results. We agree this is a possibility, and indeed it's consistent with other observations we have made of the software development process for these models. We will be happy to add this to the discussion of the results in the paper.

Tom also raises a concern with our focus on code correctness, potentially to the exclusion of other interpretations of model quality, specifically the issue of productivity. This is an important question that we have pondered during our research, and we hope to investigate this in future work. We will add a comment to this effect in the paper, to

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



clarify how we chose to focus the analysis for this study.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 5, 347, 2012.

GMDD

5, C214–C215, 2012

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C215

