

Interactive comment on “Evaluation and improvement of the Community Land Model (CLM 4.0) in Oregon forests” by T. W. Hudiburg et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 13 November 2012

I recommend publication of this study after minor revisions. I have listed more technical changes needed first, followed by more open-ended concerns:

- 1) In Section 2.3, should this not be Table 2? And Table 1 is not referenced anywhere in the text apart from here in error. Check the table numbering in general.
- 2) NRC reference is incomplete in Section 2.5.
- 3) App. A, what is FSDS?
- 4) Table 3, could you spell out Y and M?
- 5) Table A3 has the header below?
- 6) At times I feel the results have a laundry list feel to them. I am having a hard

time seeing a transition from Results to Discussion. You might consider lumping these together as there is some redundancy across sections.

7) In the summary, you mention how adjusting for historical harvest and fire emissions, as well as allowing stem wood allocation to vary with age, would likely improve model performance? Why did you not do this? I am especially concerned about the harvest and fire emissions. These are fairly straightforward to get. And having them would remove some of the guess work as to where model-data mismatch (MDM) is coming from? Is not the idea here to isolate what structural characteristics of the model are leading to MDM? In that case everything that confounds that should be controlled for. I will note that I am unsure how easy it would be to hard-wire historical trajectories of harvest and fire emissions into CLM.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 9, 12757, 2012.

BGD

9, C5644–C5645, 2012

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

