

Interactive comment on “Ensemble meteorological reconstruction using circulation analogues of 1781–1785” by P. Yiou et al.

D. Wheeler

denniswheeler1948@msn.com

Received and published: 3 October 2013

Superficially this is an engaging paper, or at least we are led to believe from the abstract. In reality it is anything but! This reviewer, and possibly it's as much a reflection on him/her as it is on the authors, was anything but engaged. The text sets out well enough and we are introduced to the data sources - fair enough - and these are critically reviewed. But then the attention is turned to the methods. Now it seems to me that the skill of science is as much as in its effective communication as it is in its findings. If one subscribes to this view the paper falls well short of what is required. The discussion of the methods is opaque to the extent of being impenetrable. There is no virtue in obscuritism and the poor reader is presented with a bewildering array of methods, none of which are discussed or described. It is indeed impossible to de-

C2216

termine anything from the conclusions on the basis of this poverty of discussion. As noted above, maybe it's just this reviewer's shortcomings that are exposed here but, publishers take note, if it's impenetrable to me it will be similarly so to others placed likewise within our discipline. In summary, I cannot comment on something that I has not been properly explained to me and would ask the authors to consider a substantial and clarifying rewrite of what I'm sure is an interesting topic for research.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 9, 5157, 2013.

C2217