

Interactive comment on “Solar radiation trend across China in recent decades: a revisit with quality-controlled data” by W.-J. Tang et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 27 September 2010

Thankyou to the Authors for their response.

(4) I think the Authors overestimate the complexity of an MC evaluation, which has the advantage of addressing more than one or two parameters' boundaries in a simple repeated calculation, very easy to program. I am not clear how did the Authors arrive at limiting the number of estimated and uncertain parameters to two, as they do not state this very clearly. There is now no time for me before the discussion closes to evaluate their claim on this issue. Assuming their claim about full precision of all the remaining parameters of a complex model is correct, I would be happy to accept the uncertainty bounds they have arrived at. However, I remain not fully satisfied with clarification of the way the number of parameters was constrained to only two and reserve my judgement on the issue.

C8044

(5) I cannot accept the argument that many others within a specific scientific community have published something in the past and therefore it must be the right thing to continue doing. Of course it was "the right thing to do" at some point in the past, but changing and broadening of views is a part of progress in science, something we cannot stop or even attempt to stop. I already posted my views on the specific issues, so will not repeat them here. In general however I feel that in order to open the climate and atmospheric science community to wider scrutiny, to provide transparent and verifiable results, to avoid future "climategates", to take part in an open debate we all need to use the generally accepted terms and methods. We cannot construct a small island with its own language. The climate community is already embracing the concepts of and the need for including uncertainty in the results. We cannot stop this change now.

The little effort involved in correcting the terms (trend etc.) in the manuscript and including the generally accepted uncertainty measures is, in my view, a small price to pay for opening these results to the scrutiny of wider scientific community, making them transparent and credible to others.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 10, 18389, 2010.

C8045