

Interactive comment on “Prediction of source contributions to urban background PM10 concentrations in European cities: a case study for an episode in December 2016 – Part.1 The country contributions” by Matthieu Pommier et al.

David Ham

david.ham@imperial.ac.uk

Received and published: 26 July 2019

I am writing as executive editor to bring to your attention several ways in which this manuscript currently does not comply with GMD policy. These issues will need to be addressed before any revised manuscript could be accepted for publication.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Title

As per https://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/about/manuscript_types.html#item4, the names and version numbers of the models being evaluated need to be included in the title of the manuscript. Please change the title accordingly.

EMEP code on GitHub

GitHub is an excellent development platform, but it is not an archival location suitable for the code used in a paper. Indeed, even GitHub themselves tell you to use Zenodo (<https://guides.github.com/activities/citable-code/>). Please therefore archive (probably using Zenodo) the precise version of EMEP used in this manuscript, and cite it from the code and data availability section. The Zenodo archive will give you the entry to paste into BibTeX or another reference manager.

LOTOS-EUROS code archive

LOTUS-EUROS causes more issues because the code is not open source. It claims to be open source, however reading its licence indicates that this is not actually true because redistribution is prohibited (see <https://opensource.org/osd> item 1). This means that properly archiving the version of LOTUS-EUROS used will not be possible. Instead, GMD policy requires you to point out that LOTUS-EUROS is only available under a restricted licence. It remains critical that the manuscript identifies the exact version used in order to enable the results to be reproduced. The manuscript should also not make the incorrect claim that the software is open source. It is unfortunate that this claim is made on the website, however that is not a reason to reproduce the error in the manuscript.

Data availability is missing

This manuscript describes a model evaluation campaign. The models were driven using data, and evaluated using data. The code and data availability section needs to point the user at the persistent public archives for the precisely identified code that was used. For a model evaluation paper, this is likely to make this section quite expansive, in contrast with its current brief extent.

Configuration files, run scripts and evaluation scripts

Reproducibility also demands that the exact configuration files and scripts used to run the models are presented, along the scripts used to process and evaluate the model output. Please also archive and cite this data.

For a fuller description of GMD's code and data evaluation policy, please see: <https://opensource.org/osd>

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2019-87>, 2019.

GMDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

