

Interactive comment on “Modelling Mediterranean agro-ecosystems by including agricultural trees in the LPJmL model” by M. Fader et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 25 August 2015

Review of paper: “Modelling Mediterranean agro-ecosystems by including agricultural trees in the LPJmL model” by Fader et al.

This is an especially well written paper, presented in a very thoughtful way, and should be published with little change. It carefully combines together model projections, tests them against comprehensive data, and illustrates the implications geographically. The reference list is long and well-considered, and in that context, serves to bring papers to the debate of environmental change that might otherwise be missed.

Much of the Methods is devoted to determining accurate known patterns of land use for the contemporary period. In a changing climate, these areas can be expected to change geographically. Maybe the authors could add a couple more sentences in Discussion, as to how an interactive assessment of future land-use can be calculated

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



(rather than relying on its prescription).

An especially interesting feature of this paper is that it introduces so many other aspects of environmental consideration, besides the climate change angle. This includes matters of biodiversity, pest-control and irrigation. Would the authors be willing to write a little more in the Discussion section as to how knowledge of some of these factors could aid stabilisation of food provision in a changing climate? In other words, better knowledge of crop response to other drivers – as this paper presents – might aid adaptation planning.

Where there remains large uncertainties in parameter settings, it might be appropriate to re-iterate these in the Discussion. So for example, lines 24, 25, p5007, where the time-before-harvest is difficult to predict due to issues of fertilisation and available water use. And for other similar examples through the paper, as this will enable the Discussion to highlight what is next required to improve models further.

This paper may have relevance regarding refugee movements, which clearly is an issue at the moment, with many attempting to leave the Southern shores of the Mediterranean. Although the current movement of people is mainly due to other reasons, it is not inconceivable that future levels of climate change could trigger similar events, should it aggravate food scarcity issues. In that context, this paper has particular importance by creating a model capable of projecting different crop yields. So a sentence, in general terms, about better predictive modelling of food security aids global planning for potential matters of migration (i.e. its possible prevention, if due to well-considered avoidance of poor food levels) may make this paper also highly relevant in socio-economic discussions?

A line in the Conclusions about feasibility of routinely seeing LPJmL, and with these new agricultural crops, either directly at the bottom of a GCM or forced with CMIP5 diagnostics, would be helpful. Is interactive prescription of land use possible, and maybe the next step in LPJmL development? (i.e. where climate is projected to change,

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



new/lost areas for the crops of this paper can be determined). I realise the paper is predominantly about the contemporary period, but much of it has multiple direct implications for impacts of different scenarios (e.g. RCP85 vs RCP60. . . .)

Minor points: There are a few very small typos in places, so another read of the manuscript before publication (or by the editors) would be beneficial. Just very small things e.g. “paves” not “pave” line 19, p4998.

Some of the paragraphs are very long, and might just be easier for the reader if they are split up a bit e.g. paragraph starting “In this context the need to perform Mediterranean-wider assessments.”.

The use references is impressive, but is there a single reference that lists the majority of the Equations? Hence as a temporary measure until the documentation (as mentioned in Section 5) is available?

Line 28, p5002. Maybe to help the reader, state what “a new input dataset” contains. i.e. what is need to drive the model. Obviously meteorological conditions, but what else. This is important should anyone be considering potential application of this model in an Earth System Model. [OK, can see this is given beginning of Section “Methods”]

Section 2.3. Give units for all quantities (or if dimensionless, then say that or show units as [.]). I assume it is standard for this area of science to give variable names as acronyms e.g. WHC. As opposed to a Greek character in equations, with “WHC” as a subscript for instance?

Some of the outliers in Fig 1 are explained in the main text (p5012). Is there anything from this that might also be appropriate in Discussion i.e. what is needed to get predictions for contemporary periods even more accurate, especially where the model currently fails?

Fig 1, is there some way of showing which countries the circles refer to. Also, is the size of yields relative to the radius, or the area of the “bubbles”?

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Only if the authors have time, but is it possible to tidy up the maps so they are on a similar projection? For instance, Figure 6, looks “squashed” in the latitude direction. Fig 3 looks on a slightly different projection to Fig 5.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8, 4997, 2015.

GMDD

8, C1773–C1776, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1776

