

Interactive comment on “The GRENE-TEA Model Intercomparison Project (GTMIP): overview and experiment protocol for Stage 1” by S. Miyazaki et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 1 June 2015

The paper describe the protocol and very preliminary results for the stage 1 of the GRENE-TEA model inter-comparison project. The proposed inter-comparison project is very interesting as it aims to compare very different kinds of models in their ability to simulate both biophysical and biogeochemicals processes of the pan-artic region. These region is obviously of first importance since it should experience the highest temperature change in the future. Because of the permafrost, there is a risk of large feedback with soil and soil carbon and then it is a very vulnerable region. Moreover the models have not been extensively evaluated for these regions. So this is and interesting subject and I am sure that project could lead to very interesting results. However the project is still at a very early stage. Then my main concern about the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

paper in its present form is that there is almost no results presented. Then I really do not understand why the authors want to publish a paper at this early stage of the project and not waiting the end of the stage 1 to present a more complete analysis of the results? I would eventually understand if the experiment protocol leads to development of specific new tools. But this is not the case here where the protocol is relatively standard for such kind of experiment. The paper gives a promising analysis plan, looking to the cause of differences between models, studies at different temporal time scale and conducting several sensitivity tests. Then part dedicated to presentation of results is very frustrating as it is less than one page and stays very descriptive without any real discussion about results. For all these reasons I think that the paper cannot be published in its present form and should be resubmitted with a complete analysis of the stage 1 results when, I am sure it will be a very interesting and useful contribution for the modelling community.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 8, 3443, 2015.

GMDD

8, C924–C925, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper