Clim. Past Discuss., 8, C83–C84, 2012 www.clim-past-discuss.net/8/C83/2012/ © Author(s) 2012. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



Interactive comment on "The impact of different glacial boundary conditions on atmospheric dynamics and precipitation in the North Atlantic region" by D. Hofer et al.

EW Wolff (Editor)

ewwo@bas.ac.uk

Received and published: 28 February 2012

Two referees have commented on your paper. They both see some interesting and worthwhile results in the paper, but both of them suggest that the paper lacks focus on the novel aspects it contains. They also both point to problems with the readability in places due to the complexity of the suite of experiments and the figures.

I concur with their opinion, and I can see that you have already taken the view that you should shorten the introductory sections that establish the credentials of the model. In doing that, I would suggest that you consider whether you need both LGM1 and LGM2 (this adds complexity for me). Please also carefully consider the presentation of all the

C83

figures. Like the reviewers I had extreme difficulty in seeing any differences between some of the figures, partly because of the colour schemes, but also because of the surprising differencing choices you made (MWxx-PI rather than MWxx-MWyy). I won't prescribe the solution, but it is important, when you make comments about differences in the text, that the figures clearly show that difference, so please consider how best to bring out the main points of the paper. Finally I agree that you need to bring out the significance of your finding that the Laurentide height significantly affects atmopsheric dynamics. Why does this matter?

Taking account of these comments, I would like to invite you to both post a response to all the review comments and to prepare a new version of your paper for consideration in CP. I would expect the new version to be shorter and less complex, and you must address in the responses and revisions all the comments made by each reviewer. I expect to send it out for re-review, as it falls into the category of major revision.

Thank you for submitting to CPD, and I look forward to your new version for CP, preferably within 1 month of the discussion closing (which is end of February).

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 8, 63, 2012.