

Interactive comment on “Anthropocene Climate Bifurcation” by Kolja Leon Kypke et al.

Kolja Leon Kypke et al.

wlangfor@uoguelph.ca

Received and published: 18 March 2020

The authors wish to thank Referee #1 for a careful reading of the manuscript and for insightful comments.

The referee recognizes the delicate balance between making the paper self-contained, and requiring the reader to consult earlier work. The authors will improve the readability of the manuscript, with the following clarifications and additions, as suggested by the referee.

1. The confusing asymmetry between equations (1) and (2) will be explained, and the use of I_A instead of T_A will be better motivated.
2. Eq. (10) for the vertical heat transport f_C will be simplified, and its derivation will be given in the Appendix.

C1

3. The crucial dependence of η on μ will be clarified in eqs. (15)(16).
4. The relationship between the EBM responses to the year 2100, shown in Fig. 6(a), to the GCM scenarios presented in IPCC AR5, Fig. A1.8, will be clarified. Both are largely determined by the RCPs.
5. The bifurcation for the Arctic EBM depends critically on the ocean heat transport F_O . The referee suggests that it would be useful to compare this EBM with classical 1D EBMs where meridional heat transport is modelled as a diffusion. The authors would be grateful if the referee could cite a paper (or papers) with which the meridional heat transport can be compared.

The authors assume that there will be a second referee report and will resubmit a revised manuscript after the second report.

Interactive comment on Nonlin. Processes Geophys. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/npg-2020-4>, 2020.

C2