

Interactive comment on “The construction of a Central Netherlands temperature” by G. van der Schrier et al.

G. van der Schrier et al.

schrier@knmi.nl

Received and published: 28 January 2011

Reply to reviewer 2

We would like to thank the reviewer for the time spent on reviewing this paper and for the useful suggestions provided.

The referee finds homogeneous regional temperature records like the Central Netherlands Temperature valuable as a comparison to climate model data. However, the main concern of the reviewer is that the ms. resembles a technical report more than a scientific paper. The referee remarks that there is almost no scientific discussion at all.

In response to these concerns we propose to change the revised paper in the following

C1414

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



[Interactive
Comment](#)

way: §6 (about the details of the detected steps and artificial trends in the records and the metadata) is moved to the Appendix of the paper. We refrain from leaving this section out altogether; documentation of the choices made in correcting for steps or trends is important and we strongly feel that this documentation should be done in the scientific literature rather than the grey literature. This section will be replaced with a new section showing comparisons between the CNT record and global gridded datasets (like those of CRU, NASA/GISS and NCDC/GHCN-D), regional gridded datasets (like E-OBS) and reanalysis datasets (like NCEP/NCAR reanalysis and the ERA40 reanalysis). This comparison shows the skill (or lack thereof) of these datasets in reproducing the CNT. This comparison will comment on the relevance of the homogenization prior to the construction of the CNT.

[Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 6, 2517, 2010.](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)