

## ***Interactive comment on “Current status on the need for improved accessibility to climate change models” by Juan Antonio Añel et al.***

**Richard Neale**

rneale@ucar.edu

Received and published: 8 September 2019

I just wanted to comment on the aim and transparency of the work in the paper.

The topic of this 'study' certainly has merit as modeling centers are trying to improve their transparency and availability of model code, but it is an ongoing process in the face of certain restrictions that were noted. I have significant concerns though, regarding its approach and methods and inappropriate speculation. One thing that stood out for me as complete speculation is the line "It is widely acknowledged that some scientists are reluctant to share code because of the perceived potential damage to their reputations". This is quite inappropriate for an academic journal, and I really do not understand what is meant by this. Being pretty intensively involved in CMIP efforts for

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



many years, I have never come across code release reluctance related to 'reputation' Furthermore, we simply have no idea how rigorous the investigation is. It quoted a whole raft of comments from various staff at institutions that cannot be attributable to anyone. We have no idea whether they spoke to junior scientist or a senior director. And it is worth pointing out that a little deception was used in the attribution to a researcher as a PhD student in their emails.

Don't get me wrong, easily accessible access to code is important in the whole climate change and climate modeling sphere, but the authors need to rethink this approach quite a bit.

Of course I will let the handling editor and reviewers determine whether they agree with me :)

Thanks Rich Neale

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2019-191>, 2019.

GMDD

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

