



Interactive  
Comment

## ***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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



renders enough phase-space samples to render appropriate statistics.

---

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

**NPGD**

1, C87–C88, 2014

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

