

Interactive comment on “The penultimate deglaciation: protocol for PMIP4 transient numerical simulations between 140 and 127 ka” by Laurie Menviel et al.

D.M. Roche

didier.roche@lsce.ipsl.fr

Received and published: 26 October 2018

I have read the manuscript and find this an effort of interest. However, I find the link to the fourth phase of the PMIP project (PMIP4) confusing at the very least.

The manuscript presented is the result of a work from a PAGES working group but is not endorsed by the PMIP4 effort nor by the deglaciation working group of PMIP4 to my knowledge. Nonetheless, the authors are presenting it as a "protocol for PMIP4 transient simulations" (title) which is incorrect. Furthermore, it has requested and apparently been granted the access to the PMIP4 Special Issue (interjournal CP/GMD)

C1

but did not follow the guidelines of the Special Issue that requested (to my knowledge again) the inclusion of the protocol manuscripts in the GMD part of the SI and not in CP. To further complicate the understanding, if the abstract correctly states the relationships between the different projects, the body of the text is less clear.

Abstract:

Here, as part of the PAGES-PMIP working group on Quaternary Interglacials, we propose a protocol to perform transient simulations of the penultimate deglaciation to complement the PMIP4 effort. which clearly indicates that the proposed protocol is not a PMIP4 one but a complement.

Text body:

We thus propose to extend the PMIP4 working group on the last deglaciation to include the penultimate deglaciation and thus create a DeglaMIP working group. This proposal has not been discussed in the PMIP4 deglacial WG to my knowledge. It is thus rather peculiar to see this aspect claimed here.

To facilitate the transient simulations of TII, we are providing a combined ice-sheet forcing (available on the PMIP4 portal), in which all different ice-sheets are merged. and Data availability. All the forcing files as well as the paleo-data described in the manuscript will be available on the PMIP4 website [link to PMIP] upon publication. are further confusing since forcing on the PMIP4 portal should be restricted to PMIP4 protocol data.

Overall, I find that neglecting as such to clearly state what the status of this particular protocol is with regard to the official PMIP4 protocol is confusing for most climate modeling groups. I therefore think that the current manuscript should make clear that:

1. the present protocol is **not** a PMIP4 endorsed protocol. This should be made

C2

crystal clear in the text, the manuscript should not be part of the inter-journal SI and the title should be modified to reflect that.

2. the present protocol is to be seen as complementary to PMIP4 and indeed as stated, as a potential bridge between different PMIP4 aspects. It should not be hosted on the same PMIP4 webpages or at the very least if no alternatives can be found, the pages should very clearly explain that the files are hosted by PMIP but not endorsed by PMIP (still confusing I think).

Best wishes,
Didier (R.)

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-106>, 2018.