Clim. Past Discuss., 4, S239–S240, 2008 www.clim-past-discuss.net/4/S239/2008/
© Author(s) 2008. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



CPD

4, S239-S240, 2008

Interactive Comment

Interactive comment on "Monsoon response to changes in Earth's orbital parameters: comparisons between simulations of the Eemian and of the Holocene" by P. Braconnot et al.

S. Levis (Referee)

slevis@ucar.edu

Received and published: 6 June 2008

I agree with A. Kitoh's comments. My main concerns with the manuscript focus on presentation.

According to the Introduction, this work discusses two new issues for a suite of periods in the past: 1) Separating the monsoon to two regions and 2) Role of the monsoon in global energetics

By section 3.2, I found it confusing to track all the time periods and the processes affecting each period relative to each other. A different presentation may help. The figures are necessary but not sufficient for this. Maybe putting the results in tabular

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



form? Section 3.3 and Fig. 7 were easier to follow, because the time periods were grouped in two logical groupings. Finally, it may help to focus only on the pieces that are new (see paragraph 2 above).

Section 4 was hard to follow as written. I suggest keeping the minimum information necessary to convey the message. Or making the major revision suggested as an option by A. Kitoh.

Language and editorial issues. I will make suggestions for a few of them: 1) Abstract: Add "3" before "in the Holocene" to make it clear that you consider a total of 6 simulations. 2) Abstract & elsewhere: I think that we would say "energetics of the tropical regions" instead of "energetic" 3) Intro: Change "Kutzback" to "Kutzbach" 4) Section 2, paragraph 1: Change "The latter" to "The latter" which is opposite to "the former." 5) Section 2.1, par. 3: I don't understand the units of degrees when discussing insolation changes. 6) Section 2.2, par. 2: Change "vertical levels" to "levels in the vertical" and there's a typo in the next instance of the word "levels" 7) Sec. 3.1, par. 3: You say "evaporation is less important over the ocean than" but do you mean "evaporation is less over the ocean than" 8) Sec. 3.2, par. 1: Change "precipitation are" to "precipitation is" 9) Sec. 3.2, par. 3: Change "suppress of" to "suppression of" 10) Sec. 4, par. 1: Change "Monsoon contributes" to "Monsoon circulations contribute" 11) Sec. 4.1: If this is the first reference to figure 4.c, why not separate it from figure 4? 12) Sec. 4.2: Change "In the other hand" to "On the other hand" 13) Fig. 7: The legend makes no mention of the density lines. 14) Fig. 9: No legend. Also, is the label PW consistent with previous usage of Q=radTOA-...?

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 4, 459, 2008.

CPD

4, S239-S240, 2008

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

