

Interactive comment on “Development and basic evaluation of a prognostic aerosol scheme in the CNRM Climate Model” by M. Michou et al.

D. Lunt

d.j.lunt@bristol.ac.uk

Received and published: 17 October 2014

Dear authors,

In my role as Executive editor of GMD, I would like to bring to your attention our Editorial:

http://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/gmd_journal_white_paper.pdf

<http://www.geosci-model-dev.net/6/1233/2013/gmd-6-1233-2013.html>

This highlights some requirements of papers published in GMD.

In particular, please note that for your paper, the following requirements have not been met in the Discussions paper – please correct this in your revised submission to GMD.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



“– The paper must be accompanied by the code, or means of accessing the code, for the purpose of peer-review. If the code is normally distributed in a way which could compromise the anonymity of the referees, then the code must be made available to the editor. The referee/editor is not required to review the code in any way, but they may do so if they so wish. “

“– All papers must include a section at the end of the paper entitled "Code availability". In this section, instructions for obtaining the code (e.g. from a supplement, or from a website) should be included; alternatively, contact information should be given where the code can be obtained on request, or the reasons why the code is not available should be clearly stated. ”

“– All papers must include a model name and version number (or other unique identifier) in the title. ”

In your instance, 'the code' would refer to just the aerosol component, rather than the whole CNRM model.

Yours,

Dan Lunt

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 7, 6263, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

