Biogeosciences Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-520-RC1, 2018
© Author(s) 2018. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Biogeosciences Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "An assessment of natural methane fluxes simulated by the CLASS-CTEM model" *by* Vivek K. et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 15 January 2018

This is a well-written and interesting model description and evaluation of CLASS-CTEM. The application of the 1-box model is helpful as a benchmark. I have just a couple of minor comments for helping improve the manuscript.

1. Please mention how the inland water flux is or is not included in the CLASS-CTEM wetland emissions estimate, referencing Bastviken, and Thornton GRL where appropriate.

2. A couple of sentences on how the 1-box model equilibrium is calculated is needed to understand how 708 ppb was estimated. Is there a spinup for this, how many years etc...

3. Does EDGAR 'agricultural soils' include rice cultivation ?

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

CC BY

4. Main criticism is that the parameter and forcing uncertainties are not explored for CLASS-CTEM. These would affect absolute estimates as well as interannual variability and trends of estimates of CH4. Some references to ancillary CLASS-CTEM studies on uncertainties would be helpful to address this shortcoming.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-520, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

CC BY