Interactive comment on “The construction of a Central Netherlands temperature” by
G. van der Schrier et al.

G. van der Schrier et al.
schrier@knmi.nl

Received and published: 28 January 2011

Reply to reviewer 2

We would like to thank the reviewer for the time spent on reviewing this paper and for
the useful suggestions provided.

The referee finds homogeneous regional temperature records like the Central Nether-
lands Temperature valuable as a comparison to climate model data. However, the
main concern of the reviewer is that the ms. resembles a technical report more than a
scientific paper. The referee remarks that there is almost no scientific discussion at all.

In response to these concerns we propose to change the revised paper in the following
way: §6 (about the details of the detected steps and artificial trends in the records and
the metadata) is moved to the Appendix of the paper. We refrain from leaving this sec-
tion out altogether; documentation of the choices made in correcting for steps or trends
is important and we strongly feel that this documentation should be done in the scien-
tific literature rather than the grey literature. This section will be replaced with a new
section showing comparisons between the CNT record and global gridded datasets
(like those of CRU, NASA/GISS and NCDC/GHCN-D), regional gridded datasets (like
E-OBS) and reanalysis datasets (like NCEP/NCAR reanalysis and the ERA40 reanaly-
sis). This comparison shows the skill (or lack thereof) of these datasets in reproducing
the CNT. This comparison will comment on the relevance of the homogenization prior
to the construction of the CNT.
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