

Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Recent variability of the solar spectral irradiance and its impact on climate modelling” by I. Ermolli et al.***

**J. Fontenla**

johnf@digidyna.com

Received and published: 14 November 2012

The authors' reply still does not acknowledge that their text should mention that the negative visible/FIR behavior of model P at disk center was introduced in 1999 in response to ground-based published data. This is a very short but essential point about SRPM modeling of SSI, and although the authors agree in fixing other issues they explicitly ignore this point.

The authors' reply says “We will also use only the terms employed in the original (2011) paper to describe the recent modifications.”, but still ignores the simple point clearly stated in Fontenla et al 2011, and repeated in (3) below. It is essential that your paper not just extract words about the “recent modifications” from my text but convey the CONTENT of my paper entire paragraph. This paragraph clearly says that the un-

C9337

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment

modified models already contained negative vis/FIR trends. This is not an additional comment but has been all the same since this discussion started. However, the authors' reply still tries to mislead by only mentioning the last sentence of the paragraph and omitting the rest. This paragraph is [60] and starts at the end of page 10; I invite the authors and the reviewer's to read it complete.

Also, I must reply to the authors' last reply misleading statements: 1) I only learn from one of the coauthors that you were going to write a paper and gave him some text, of which little made it to your paper submission. I never saw what you have done with that or what you were submitting. I only found your written paper in this website and complained about its distortions. 2) I learn about this website from two people who are not in the paper. Afterwards, I discussed your paper with one of the coauthors at the HEPPA/SOLARIS meeting and complained about her poster at that meeting, also about the same things I am criticizing in this discussion. 3) Again, the authors' still do not acknowledge the simple facts: The negative visible/IR behavior was introduced in Fontenla et al 1999 and remained ever since. An OAR paper acknowledged that in 2004. It was obviously also present in the 2009 paper, e.g. Fig. 2 shows the lower photospheric temperature of model P, and the first panel of Fig. 7 in that paper show the SRPM computed continuum of model P is the lowest. Thus, baffles me this paper insists on the comment that OAR did not find this and fails to comment the original paper did find it. If OAR used the 2009 complete models and performed a correct calculation, the lower vis continuum must have been evident as it is in the original paper figures.

In addition, I have strong reservations about the fairness of your biased recommendations since the modeling authors of this paper only show their intention of dismissing SRPM and promoting their own models. I believe their models are wrong and sweep under the rug published ground-based observational results that disproved those models, but I see the modeling authors refuse to recognize this.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

