

Interactive comment on “The radiative forcing potential of different climate geoengineering options” by T. M. Lenton and N. E. Vaughan

T. M. Lenton and N. E. Vaughan

Received and published: 26 June 2009

The point is well taken that our paper is not exhaustive in seeking to approximately quantify different geoengineering options. As well as those identified by Roger Clark, we have also been alerted to several other recent geoengineering suggestions, including increasing olivine weathering (Schuiling and Krijgsman, 2006), burying wood in soils (Zeng, 2008) or burying crop residue in the deep ocean (Strand and Benford, 2009). Our stated aim was to consider options addressed in the recent literature and whilst Roger Clark’s ideas are of interest, as no references are given and we have got rather a lot to deal with in addressing the critiques of the two anonymous referees, we would prefer not to extend this paper by adding new sections trying to quantify other geoengineering options. Instead we have set down a general approach and encourage others to make use of it to quantify further geoengineering proposals.

References:

Schuilng, R. D., and Krijgsman, P.: Enhanced weathering: an effective and cheap tool to sequester CO₂, *Clim. Change*, 74, 349-354, 2006.

Strand, S. E., and Benford, G.: Ocean sequestration of crop residue carbon: recycling fossil fuel carbon back to deep sediments, *Envir. Sci. Technol.*, 43, 1000-1007, 2009.

Zeng, N.: Carbon sequestration via wood burial, *Carbon Balance and Management*, 3, 1, 10.1186/1750-0680-3-1, 2008.

Interactive comment on *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss.*, 9, 2559, 2009.

ACPD

9, S2656–S2657, 2009

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S2657

