

## ***Interactive comment on “The Cloud Feedback Model Intercomparison Project (CFMIP) contribution to CMIP6” by Mark J. Webb et al.***

**J. C. Hargreaves (Editor)**

jules@blueskiesresearch.org.uk

Received and published: 4 August 2016

This seems to me to be a pretty good MIP manuscript. You do have the advantage that the protocols for the experiments are relatively simple to describe, but I still think it very well organised. I haven't checked all the protocols - just a couple that I am particularly interested in - but the information seemed complete for those. However, please do check through your revised manuscript to make sure that a third party could set up each run from the information provided. The remaining peculiarity is the reference to boundary conditions that will become available through other papers in this special issue - are there now references that can be provided for these papers?

The thing I spotted in the reviewers' comments that I am unsure about is the suggestion to abbreviate the citations to increase readability. Here's an example,

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



"Temperature and humidity tendency terms in particular have been shown to be useful for understanding the roles of different parts of the model physics in cloud feedbacks and adjustments (Kamae and Watanabe 2012; Williams et al., 2013; Webb and 509 Lock 2013; Demoto et al., 2013; Sherwood et al., 2014; Ogura et al., 2014; Brient et al., 2015) "

I generally don't like the idea of reducing the citations, but that is an awful lot of references all apparently showing the same thing! As a reader I'd want to know what the difference is between these papers, and which one I should look up in order to learn about the thing I am specifically interested in. The obvious solution would be to add a little more description, so that the reader has more knowledge about the content of the references. Doing so will make the manuscript longer, which could get out of hand, but maybe there is a middle way which produces a more readable and more useful manuscript...?

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., doi:10.5194/gmd-2016-70, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

