

Interactive comment on “Technical Note: Approximate Bayesian parameterization of a complex tropical forest model” by F. Hartig et al.

C. Reyer (Referee)

reyer@pik-potsdam.de

Received and published: 26 August 2013

I have now re-read the manuscript in light of my comments (and reply to them) made in the first round of review. I have not re-checked the online material since it has not changed since the last version. The paper has improved a lot and I only have a few minor comments that may help the authors to further enhance the manuscript. I would like to highlight that the discussion is very rich and interesting.

P13098L1-2: Is it not a problem of ecological modelling rather than of ecology and evolution? (It's a matter of taste and the latter is of course also true but I feel the former is more precise).

P13100L8-9: I do not understand was this sentence means and how it refers to the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



sentence before. Reformulate?

P13100L13-14: “this route was blocked” ⇒ find another formulation

Introduction: would be good to once clearly state the objective and/or main research questions^

P13102L2: “exhibit” ⇒ delete

P13102L25-26: In the paragraph before you said that the trees do not have an explicit position? This is confusing. . .

P13103L2: “The model is Markov. . .” Reformulate (sounds a bit like technical jargon) and maybe add a sentence introducing Markov methods since you can not assume that everybody knows that.

P13104L21: “process-stochasticity” ⇒ is stochastic processes not clearer or do you mean something else? If yes, explain.

P10306L17: Here the passive form “is required” seems stylistically more logical

P10306L22: “field data” is misleading since you also use virtual data.#

P10307L5: “informal model calibration” ⇒ Never heard this term before, I think you mean manual calibration based on visual assessment of model fit to data. Probably how you call it is correct, just check if this is what you actually mean to avoid misunderstandings or simply call it manual calibration since you also use that term later.

P10307L14-16: So other parameters do not influence the outputs you looked at?

P10309L5ff: It’s trivial that varying more parameters as you did in V2 will widen the posterior distribution. I think you can not really compare that with the posterior distribution of simulations where less parameters have been varied. Would rather be interesting to discuss how many parameters (as in V1 or in V2?) need to be varied. I would argue the more the better but since you are aware of strong correlations between your

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

parameters you could argue otherwise.

P103110L12: “by from” ⇒ revise

P103110L7: Looking at Fig 5, I think it is important to note that in quite some cases, the values of Dieslich et al (2009) are outside the range found used in this study.

Fig 1: How do you define extreme values (beyond one SD)? I would rather call that the full range or so.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 13097, 2013.

BGD

10, C4542–C4544, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C4544

