

Interactive comment on “The penultimate deglaciation: protocol for PMIP4 transient numerical simulations between 140 and 127 ka, version 1.0” by Laurie Menviel et al.

Julia Hargreaves (Editor)

jules@blueskiesresearch.org.uk

Received and published: 28 May 2019

The original version of this manuscript was reviewed at Climate of the Past (https://www.clim-past-discuss.net/cp-2018-106/ doi:10.5194/cp-2018-106). As the online review there shows, two positive reviews and some interesting comments from the community were received and responded to. The coordinator of the PMIP4 special issue in GMD and CP decided that the manuscript should have been submitted to GMD rather than CP. This is because it is very clearly a model experiment description. Therefore, the paper was withdrawn from CP, revised in accordance with the initial review at CP, and then submitted to GMD. The authors helpfully provided me with the diff file for

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



their revision compared to the version reviewed at CP. After some further revision at the initial editor's decision stage to make sure that the manuscript more or less complied with GMD requirements, I decided that it was sufficient to recall the two original CP reviewers. Both agreed to review, but only one has actually provided a review. I have decided to draw a line under the other reviewer's repeated promises to respond soon, and have now checked carefully through their review at CP (reviewer 2 in the CP version), and the author's response. I conclude (as you see in my short review!) that the authors adequately responded to that reviewer.

Therefore, please revise the manuscript in accordance with the new comments from Reviewer 1 and my additional comments below, which were mostly brought to my attention by Reviewer 1's original review at CP.

1. In order for "recommend" to be interpreted as "should" you need to include a sentence in the manuscript where you state that this is your new definition of this word. Otherwise it will be misinterpreted. So, either define "recommend", or change "recommend" to "should" where relevant.

2. Some information on the merger of the ice sheets was provided in the response to the reviewer, but I do not see this in the manuscript. Readers need to know what you have done. As well as a clear description, can you also provide the individual ice sheets and the code as well as the final result?

3. A similar theme for the Red Sea records... I am not convinced that the sea-level evolution result is reproducible from what you have written, so providing the associated data and code used to derive the new result would be very useful.

3. The data availability section needs updating to include the information that the forcings are included in the supplement. All forcings should be in the manuscript itself, or in the supplement, or on a public repository with a unique and persistent identifier (such as a DOI).

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2019-41>, 2019.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

