

Interactive comment on “Model evaluation of high-resolution urban climate simulations: using WRF ARW/LSM/SLUCM model as a case study” by Zhiqiang Li et al.

Zhiqiang Li et al.

pater_lee@hotmail.com

Received and published: 28 November 2018

We appreciate reviewer 1 for spending time to review our paper and providing some valuable comments. We provided a quick response first and will provide a detail response later. The article is in pertinent response to the increasing presence of ambiguous or careless modelling practices in urban-scale climatology. Moreover, it is intended to state the necessity of model evaluation of urban-scale climatology modelling, draw attention within the community of urban climate modellers, and be a kick-off in reducing these window-dressing-like modelling practices. The purpose of this paper is for reminding the modellers the necessary of model evaluation in the urban climate mod-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



elling practices rather than helping the model developer to improve the model. The modeller should conduct a systematic model evaluation to establish the trustworthiness of the new findings from an urban climate modelling because the model cannot be verified or validated. Moreover, we reminded that the modeller should be cautious to conclude a quantitative finding because it is impossible to identify the natural gap, observation bias, and model bias in the difference between observations and its corresponding modelled results. We are confident that this paper is important to climate modeller community because it point out the pain points which the existence of uncertainties of model affect the trustworthiness of the new findings and it is impossible to identify the uncertainties of model completely.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2018-220>, 2018.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

