Interactive comment on "Bias correction of multi-ensemble simulations from the HAPPI model intercomparison project" *by* Fahad Saeed et al.

Fahad Saeed et al.

fahad.saeed@climateanalytics.org

Received and published: 16 October 2018

After the rejection of my manuscript "gmd-2018-65", I was suggested to submit the manuscript to a related journal under https://editor.copernicus.org/ESD/transfer/gmd-2018-65. However, from this link, I once again ended up submitting the manuscript to GMD. This could well be error of the system OR an unfortunate human error on our part. Once the manuscript went under review, we were convinced that the manuscript was good enough to go under revisions. But after a long waiting period of 5 months, to our surprise, the issue of the manuscript being "out of scope" once again came up.

We have so far received one review report on the manuscript, and it can be seen that the referee is quite satisfied with the exhaustive nature of the analysis we conducted

for this paper. The only point he raised is about the "extension of the state-of-the-art". Thus, in reply to the referee comments, we argue that the ISIMIP2b bias correction technique (or any bias correction technique) is applied for the first time to HAPPI style experiments. It has done a very satisfactory job in keeping the spread of the intra-model ensemble, besides improving mean, variability and different extreme indices. We also argue how it extends the state-of-the-art by providing the evidence that the ISIMIP-2b bias correction technique is suitable for the applications similar to HAPPI. This needs to be done for other bias correction techniques as well.

Since the main focus of HAPPI experiment is on the differentiating impact of 0.5°C, therefore, after the publication of IPCC special report on global warming of 1.5°C, the bias corrected HAPPI data is expected to be used in different impact modeling studies at regional as well as global scale. Therefore, it will become very important for the impact modellers and scientists to always refer to the strength and weakness of this bias correction technique.

Our paper has already caught interest of scientific community with over 400 views since the time of its upload. Considering the potentiality of this manuscript to be cited in different upcoming studies, we request editors to kindly reconsider their decision of retraction of this manuscript.