Nonlinear Processes
in Geophysics
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Implications of model error for numerical climate prediction" *by* O. Martínez-Alvarado

O. Martinez-Alvarado

O.MartinezAlvarado@reading.ac.uk

Received and published: 29 April 2014

I would like to thank both reviewers for their comments. A full response to all reviewers' comments will be given shortly. However, at this point I only want to present this clarification note regarding Anonymous Referee #2's comments on the advantage that a toy model represents to produce long-term simulations and therefore a decent statistical analysis. I agree with this statement and this is indeed what has been done despite the wrong and misleading description of the methodology I made in Section 2. I state there that the simulations were 100 t.u. long and that the first 20 t.u. were discarded to get rid of initial transients. This is incorrect. The long-term simulations were 10000 t.u. long with a 5000-t.u.-initial period discarded. The forecast cycles were initialised every 5 t.u. as described in Section 3. Therefore there were 1000 forecast cycles, which

renders enough phase-space samples to render appropriate statistics.

Interactive comment on Nonlin. Processes Geophys. Discuss., 1, 131, 2014.