

IPCC Working Group I Fourth Assessment Report
Expert and Government Review Comments on the Second-Order Draft

Chapter 11

Batch B (15 June 2006)

Notes

The following table of expert and government review comments are for consideration by the chapter author teams. They require a formal response to each comment from the team, and those responses will be archived.

Responding to review comments and record keeping

The chapter writing teams must consider all review comments and record an agreed response in the following table. This may be done by discussing the more general and substantive comments among the whole author team and then allocating responsibilities for responding to specific comments to the relevant authors. Note that responses should be understandable by someone scrutinizing the archived comments file after the report has been finalized.

Responses should generally be brief but clear. The following, or similar, styles of responses are suggested:

- Where the authors agree with the comment and have made a corresponding change:
Accepted - without comment (e.g., in case of minor modifications) or with brief comments (e.g., where partially accepted)
- Where the authors agree with the comment and changes are not necessary or changes are made in a different section:
Taken into account - with brief explanation (e.g. “see section X.Y”)
- Where the comment does not require a specific change, or the issue is already dealt with in the draft:
No change necessary – with brief explanation where appropriate (e.g. “covered in next paragraph”, “covered in section X.Y”)
- Where the authors do not agree with a suggested change:
Rejected – always with a brief explanation (e.g. “insufficient literature to support this”, “outside scope of section”, “outside purview and competence of WG1”, etc)
- Where dealing with very similar comments or a common thread of comments from one reviewer and a response has been given to the corresponding earlier comment(s):
See comment X-Y.
- Only where it is clear that the reviewer is not suggesting a specific revision to the chapter.
Noted - with or without comments.

It is recommended that you do not use names of individual members of the author team in the final responses to comments. I.e., responses should represent the entire chapter team. Where a comment involves another chapter please liaise with the authors of that chapter as appropriate but retain the comment and response in the comment file that you were sent. I.e., do not transfer comments.

Please provide the Technical Support Unit with the completed version of this document as a single electronic file by August 4, 2006.

No.	Batch	Page:line		Comment	Notes
		From	To		
11-1648	B	8:28	8:37	There is no mention of the update frequency of the boundary forcing fields (possibly a greater source of error for RCMs than the boundary-value closure schemes). [Govt. of Ireland (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2025-5)]	
11-1649	B	54:2	54:13	The paper by Tebaldi et al (2006) show some simulation of extremes in South America using the IPCC AR4 models and show a signal of warming even though the extremes of rainfall are different in the various models [Govt. of Brazil (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2024-29)]	