

Interactive comment on “Global Sensitivity Analysis of Parameter Uncertainty in Landscape Evolution Models” by Christopher J. Skinner et al.

T. Coulthard

t.coulthard@hull.ac.uk

Received and published: 29 October 2017

Thank you for bringing this to our attention.

Addressing the final code availability point first - we have a link to the version of the model used at the end the paper - but we can readily change this to a version specific zenodo link and also add model data. We have made use of zenodo in the paper to link to examples of model parameters from previous studies.

However, we are somewhat confused by some aspects of the comment posted - as when preparing the MS and reading the criteria/ requirements for GMD papers, the description for model evaluation papers (of which ours is) is quite clearly stated as:

Model evaluation papers

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Model evaluation is an important component of most GMD papers. Model development papers in particular often include a large proportion of evaluation. Typically, this comprises a comparison of the performance of different model configurations or parameterisations. In some cases, the evaluation is sufficiently substantial that a stand-alone paper is required. In this case it is required that the model, model development, or model experiment has already been described in another paper (or that the description is also under review). The authors should provide the citation of the description paper in the evaluation manuscript itself and also in the letter to the editor when submitting an evaluation manuscript. If the description is in GMD then there is the possibility of linking the papers, either in the form of a companion paper (e.g. Part 1 and Part 2), or as part of a special issue devoted to a particular model or experiment.

It is, however, common for pure evaluation papers to contain substantial conclusions about geoscience rather than about models, and such papers are not suitable for submission to GMD. These are more likely to reach the appropriate audience in those EGU journals which publish scientific results related to the GMD subject areas.

The above does not mention any requirement to have the model name/version number in the title and the criteria highlighted in the comment quite clearly refers to Model Description papers - not evaluation - as per https://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/about/manuscript_types.html

Therefore, the instructions on the GMD webpage and the comment posted seem contradictory. If there is an error in the above web page and the model description criteria also apply to evaluation papers then could you please advise us and we can update the paper accordingly - and also could you modify GMD's web pages to account for this?

Adding the model name is no big deal and we are quite happy to do this - but we initially chose to have no model name in our paper as the paper is partly about evaluating a method for model evaluation - with the broader outlook that this could be used for

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



evaluating other model types. However, we do explore this method using the CAESAR-Lisflood model - and a substantial part of the paper is therefore about evaluating that model.

Best wishes

Tom Coulthard (on behalf of the Authors)

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2017-236>, 2017.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

