

HighResMIP2 reviewer comments on revised version

Report 1

Thank you for addressing my suggestion and connecting explicitly to the new scenario protocol.

As far as I am concerned the paper should be accepted. I just have a small suggestion/correction related to the mention of the Medium scenario. Right now you say: "we propose to recommend their Medium future scenario that will produce an additional radiative forcing, at the end-of-century, of around 5.3 W m^{-2} ". As you know, in our paper we present those scenario trajectories as illustrative, based on estimates from a simple climate model (FaIR to be specific). We really do not know what the RF for these scenarios will be, especially this time around, as we recommend they be run in emission-driven mode. Could I suggest to slightly rephrase and say: "we propose to recommend their Medium future scenario, estimated to produce a radiative forcing, at the end-of-century, around or possibly slightly above 5 W m^{-2} " ? Feel free to reword, but I would like to communicate some fuzziness here, and 5.3 seems awfully precise. I also deleted "additional" as it is not clear to me what that would be additional to, but again feel free to push back on that deletion if you have strong opinions, as long as it is clear that that number (5 W m^{-2}) is RF compared to 0 (pre-Industrial). Thank you again. At this time the ScenarioMIP paper is still in GMD limbo, will let you know as soon as it is fully citable. Claudia

Response:

Many thanks Claudia.

We have made this exact change in the text around L477.