

Interactive comment on “Community Intercomparison Suite (CIS) v1.3.2: A tool for intercomparing models and observations” by D. Watson-Parris et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 19 April 2016

This paper presents the Community Intercomparison Suite, a freely-available Python package for processing, analysing and plotting model and observational data of various type (in-situ and satellite). This software represents a valuable tool for data analysis in the climate community. It is well documented in this paper and a detailed documentation is also available on the CIS webpage.

The manuscript is well written and mostly clear, although some minor improvements are required before publication in GMD. See some suggestions in the following.

Page 1, Line 17: please add a reference for the statement about CMIP6.

Page 2, Line 17: there are other tools which are able to read and process observational

C1

data, for example the ESMValTool (Eyring et al., GMDD 2015) and the PCMDI metrics package (Gleckler et al., EOS 2015). Please mention them in the text.

Page 2, Line 23: I would be more specific here, by writing: “e.g., from the obs4MIPS project, Texeira et al., 2014”.

Page 7, Line 24: what if the datafile does not contain units information? This is often the case when working with ungridded data which do not comply any standard. Does CIS attempt to correct units inconsistency/errors in the input data? Does the user have any control on that?

Page 11, Line 15: how are missing values in non-NetCDF files handled (i.e., if there is no explicit `_FillValue` attribute)?

Page 12, Line 12: are other regridding methods (e.g. area/energy-conserving) available? Is a support for non-regular grids (e.g., ocean grids) planned for the future?

Page 17, Line 13: this sentence is unclear. Please clarify what are the security issues mentioned here.

Page 21, Line 4: as mentioned above, there are other tools which allow to compare multiple dataset. Please rephrase this sentence.

Appendix A: the Table of definitions is quite short (only 4 terms). I would suggest moving the definitions to their first occurrence in the main text (as a footnote or similar).

Page 24, Line 22: are the user-provided plugins tested before they are made available to the CIS community? Please specify.

TEXT CORRECTIONS

Page 3, Line 16: *it's* → *its*.

Page 8, Algorithm 1: *iff* → *if*.

Page 9, L26: *an collocation* → *a collocation*.

C2

