

***Interactive comment on “Pliocene Model  
Intercomparison Project (PlioMIP): experimental  
design and boundary conditions (Experiment 1)”  
by A. M. Haywood et al.***

**A. M. Haywood et al.**

a.haywood@see.leeds.ac.uk

Received and published: 5 January 2010

Dear Julia,

Thank you for the comment.

Re the first point. The palaeoclimate modelling community is quite small and yet it engages in the MIPs very well, which I guess might explain the difficulty but two excellent reviewers were found.

Given the fact that models differ so substantially in their detail I see no alternative to setting up and running a MIP through wide ranging consultation and engagement with

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the community. I could have gone it alone and set up the MIP in a Hadley Centre Model-centric way, it would have been far easier for me, but I think the community would not thank me for it and would be unlikely to engage, so what would be the point? So input from others is essential and that input must be recognised.

The reviewers comments will of course be taken seriously and their suggested changes implemented to the best of our ability.

---

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., 2, 1215, 2009.

**GMDD**

2, C486–C487, 2010

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

