

Interactive comment on “How wrong are climate field reconstruction techniques in reconstructing a climate with long-range memory?” by Tine Nilsen et al.

Tine Nilsen et al.

tine.nilsen@uit.no

Received and published: 22 May 2018

We are very grateful for the input from the three anonymous reviewers and hope that all major points have been answered satisfactory. Please see the individual responses to reviewers 1, 2 and 3 on matters that are not discussed in this general reply.

In the revised manuscript, Martin Rypdal will be added as an author as he has contributed significantly to Sect. 2.2 on target data generation. Rypdal's contribution has grown since the original submission so that co-authorship is appropriate.

The most important changes requested by all three reviewers involve (1) changing the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



title, (2) rewriting the abstract and (3) rewrite discussion/conclusions to be more precise and informative. Other relevant modifications we find necessary is to (4) rewrite/clarify Sect. 2.2 on target data generation to avoid confusion and misconceptions, (5) elaborate on the CRPS skill metric in Sect. 4.4, and inserting selected formulas into the appendix. At last, (6) we have discovered an error in the calculation of the average CRPS scores that influences our skill metric results.

See the supplementary file attached for detailed comments on points 1-6.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.clim-past-discuss.net/cp-2018-17/cp-2018-17-AC4-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-17>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

