

Interactive comment on “Coupled simulations of the mid-Holocene and Last Glacial Maximum: new results from PMIP2” by P. Braconnot et al.

J. Hargreaves (Editor)

jules@jamstec.go.jp

Received and published: 11 February 2007

The second reviewer thinks the paper lacks focus and has suggested splitting it up, concentrating on Section 4 and publishing Section 5 elsewhere. I have an alternative suggestion for you to consider which I think has the potential to solve Reviewer #2's concerns about the paper lacking focus while maintaining the PMIP2-reference aspect of the paper.

So my suggestion is that you split the paper into Part 1 and Part 2, which will sit next to each other in the special issue, making the split at the end of section 3.

Part 1 would therefore be the reference for the experimental protocol and overview results.

Part 2 would have the more in depth analyses and more scientific results.

With these different aspects covered by the two papers I would hope you would be better able to focus and clarify each one. In fact having the two papers might also help the readers focus better.

I ran this idea by the chief editors to see if it was possible and they seem to think that it would be. So - can you consider this idea and see if you and your co-authors think it might be a good plan?

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 2, 1293, 2006.

CPD

2, S873–S874, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper