

Interactive comment on “STAGE 2.0: Sensitivity Transfer Analysis of Greenhouse Emissions” by Peter O. Passenier

P.O. Passenier

passenr@ziggo.nl

Received and published: 3 September 2018

Thank you very much for your time to review my manuscript.

Although you obviously appreciate its main objective by recognizing that “Communicating and conveying the critical thresholds and feedbacks within the climate systems to non-specialists is a laudable objective”, you at the end of your review arrive at the recommendation to reject the manuscript for publication in Geoscience Communication.

Your main argument is that to achieve its main objective, summarized as “helping to communicate climate sensitivity to non-specialists”, a fundamental re-focusing and re-organisation of the study would be required, which is too large a task to be major revision.

C1

Although I agree with your summary at the end of your review that the present version of the manuscript “does a poor job of explaining who it is for, what its objectives are and what its key messages are”, I however see possibilities for fundamental improvement with respect to these issues in a feasible manner. I refer to my more detailed response to the first reviewer’s comments, who encountered more or less identical main objections as the ones formulated by you.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2018-5>, 2018.

C2