

Comments from the editor to the authors of the manuscript entitled “PlioMIP2 simulations with NorESM-L and NorESM1-F”

It would be interesting to know what exactly in the two models is causing them to show such contrasting salinities. The difference in the signs of the sea surface salinity change really stood out.

Below, I list a (non-exhaustive) list of non-technical corrections the authors should consider:

Page 1, line 23: become → becomes

Page 2, line 7: The global mean sea level was higher than that of today, with a peak of 22 ± 10 meters (Miller et al., 2012)

Page 5, line 20: ... similar pattern to those...

Page 5, line 21: ...in Circum-Arctic regions...

Page 5, line 27: no comma after ‘of’

Page 6, line 18: ...except for Baffin Bay...

Page 7, line 21: -21.6 for the Pliocene experiment...

Page 7, line 28: ...versions is likely to be associated...

Page 8, line 3: Add ‘Therefore’ to be beginning of the sentence so that it links with the previous statement.

Page 8, line 6: The presence of less sea ice leads to a reduction in albedo and to a more active ocean-atmosphere interaction, contributing to...

Page 8, line 8: ...ventilation in the Southern Ocean...

Page 8, line 22: appears → appear

Page 10, line 4: ...testing the impacts of the differences between the boundary conditions of PlioMIP1 and those of PlioMIP2, ie...

Page 10, line 10: requests → request

Tables 3 and 5: The numbers are written in groups of 3 (ANN, JJA and DJF). It may be easier to visualise and to compare if the authors inserted a gap on either side of the slashes, or put each number on a separate line.