

## Ravinesh Deo

---

**From:** onbehalfof+weather+wiley.co.uk@manuscriptcentral.com on behalf of weather@wiley.co.uk  
**Sent:** Friday, 16 July 2010 7:47 AM  
**To:** Ravinesh Deo; physrcd@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Weather - Decision on Manuscript ID WEA-10-0035.R3

15-Jul-2010

Dear Dr. Deo,

It is a pleasure to accept your manuscript entitled "Links between native forest and climate in Australia" in its current form for publication in Weather. I do have to tell you, though, that we have a considerable amount of material currently being processed and it will be a few months before your article appears in Weather - but it will be published.

Thank you for your contribution.

Yours sincerely,

Bob Prichard  
Editor, Weather  
[weather@wiley.co.uk](mailto:weather@wiley.co.uk)

## Ravinesh Deo

---

**From:** onbehalfof+weather+wiley.co.uk@manuscriptcentral.com on behalf of weather@wiley.co.uk  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 31 March 2010 1:31 AM  
**To:** Ravenish Deo; physrcd@yahoo.com  
**Subject:** Weather - Decision on Manuscript ID WEA-10-0035

30-Mar-2010

Dear Dr. Deo,

Manuscript ID WEA-10-0035 entitled "Links between forests and climate in Australia" which you submitted to Weather has been reviewed. The comments of the reviewers are included at the bottom of this letter.

A revised version of your manuscript that takes into account the comments of the reviewers will be reconsidered for publication.

You have 150 days to submit your revised paper, after which the online submission system will block the upload of your revisions. If you need more time then please let Alexandra Owen (weather@wiley.com) know.

Please note that submitting a revision of your manuscript does not guarantee eventual acceptance, and that your revision may be subject to re-review by the reviewers before a decision is rendered.

You can upload your revised manuscript and submit it through your Author Center. Log into <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/weather> and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions".

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewers in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript.

**IMPORTANT:** Please make sure you closely follow the instructions for acceptable files. When submitting (uploading) your revised manuscript, please delete the file(s) that you wish to replace and then upload the revised file(s).

Please remember that the publishers will not accept a manuscript unless accompanied by the Copyright Transfer Agreement. Please go to:  
<http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/homepages/113388511/nscta.pdf>

The Copyright Transfer Form and the Permissions Form should be scanned and uploaded with your submission to Manuscript Central, designated as "Supplemental Material not for review". If you do not have access to a scanner, further instructions will be provided upon the acceptance of your paper. Forms should not be sent to the editorial office.

Once again, thank you for submitting your manuscript to Weather and I look forward to receiving your revision.

Yours sincerely,

Bob Prichard  
Editor, Weather  
weather@wiley.co.uk

Reviewers' Comments to Author:

## Reviewing: 1

### Comments to the Author

This is certainly a topic of interest to Weather readers and the article is generally presented in an accessible way, suitable for our readership. I do however have some concerns about the comprehensiveness of the review and more minor concerns about the style of the paper, as outlined below.

#### • Originality and comprehensiveness

The article is clearly based on the work produced by the same authors in the cited reference Deo et al. (2009), Geops. Res. Lett.

Large parts of the discussion on page 3 clearly use this as the basis for their conclusions. As such, I am slightly concerned that the paper does not comprehensively review the literature in this area. I imagine there are some other studies which consider the detailed impact of changes to land-cover change on Australian climate and suggest that the authors attempt to compare and contrast these studies with their own in the section on Land Surface Feedbacks in the Climate System.

• Figure 1 and details of land cover changes in Australia It was very unclear to me what Fig. 1 shows and how the data used in the figure is derived. As it stands the figure doesn't add anything to the manuscript. I suggest the authors describe this figure in more detail and expand the section Land Cover Change to describe how changes in land cover are derived and what these changes are.

#### Minor issues

• p2 line 8 '...unequivocal economic cost to Australian community...' This statement needs supporting evidence: could you add a reference to discuss the impact and perhaps quantify the economic cost?

• p2 line 26 The bunny fence discussion is very interesting, is there a reference for this work?

• p3 line 31 I didn't understand why a drier lower atmosphere would lead to less evaporation, surely the reverse would be true?

• Throughout the manuscript, there are many small errors in the English used. In particular, there are many examples of a missing definite article (e.g. p1 line 34: On regional scale. All these instances need correcting.

## Reviewing: 2

### Comments to the Author

The article is a review of studies investigating the impact of land cover change on Australian regional climate. I believe the subject of the article would be of much interest to the readership of Weather and recommend publication, subject to the issues below being addressed.

The article is generally well written. However, there are a number of examples of where 'the' has been omitted from sentences, e.g. in the background 'On \* global scale, deforestation may increase or decrease', which needs a 'the' where marked by the \*.

More specific comments are:

#### SUMMARY

1) The acronym 'ENSO' needs to be defined.

2) Is there a reference that could be added for the numbers that are quoted (1.2 million km<sup>2</sup> clearance; dates of clearance; also the numbers in the land cover change section)? I was unable to see them in the Barson reference.

#### BACKGROUND

1) First two sentences - these should be refined to reflect the uncertainties in the model predictions and observations.

2) The reference for the IPCC report is missing from the references section at the end.

- 3) The details of Hennesy et al. (2008) are missing from the references. The only paper with this name and date I could find was called 'Climate change effects on snow conditions in mainland Australia and adaptation at ski resorts through snowmaking', but this does not seem to be quite consistent with how the reference is used.
- 4) I couldn't find the information from the last sentence of the first paragraph of this section in the Pitman reference. Is this the correct reference?
- 5) 'The Sahel has experienced decreases in mean rainfall of ~20-40%' - it would be interesting to the reader to have details of when this occurred and the amount of deforestation. It was unclear to me whether the Los et al. reference was the correct one to use. Although this does show precipitation figures, I found it difficult to relate the information in the reference to the statement in this paper.
- 6) 'This warming was paralleled by increases in rainfall in northwest and decreases in central, southwest and southeast Australia (Timbal, 2006)' - the reference used seems to be a model study, principally about south west Australia. Is this the best reference to use?
- 7) 'Historical data ... climate extremes that are regionally confined' - the Gallant reference used refers to rainfall. Are there other references that could additionally be included for temperature extremes?
- 8) Nicholls, 2004 is missing from the reference list.
- 9) The comma in the last sentence is unnecessary.

#### CLIMATE SIGNALS IN OBSERVATION AND MODELLING EXERCISES

- 1) Are there references for the observational assessments mentioned in the first paragraph?
- 2) The acronym CSIRO needs to be defined.
- 3) The discussion of the McAlpine et al. (2007) results could be expanded to give an idea of the regional variation of the changes and should be made more specific about what the numbers refer to (e.g. it looks like the rainfall figure might be for summer rainfall; either that the range given is incorrect and should be 4-8%).

#### LAND SURFACE FEEDBACKS IN THE CLIMATE SYSTEM

- 1) 'The net effect of increase in number of hot days is a drier lower atmosphere' - I didn't understand how an increase in hot days leads to a drier atmosphere. Would it be possible to clarify this sentence in the article?
- 2) I noticed that the last two sentences of the Climate Signals in Observation and Modelling Exercises section and some of the Land Surface Feedbacks in the Climate System section refer to a paper by the author of the current article. The description of the results is almost identical in places to how it is stated in that paper: perhaps the wording might be changed, and some updating from other studies be included?

#### CONCLUDING COMMENTS

- 1) Second to last sentence - the 'of' needs deleting.

#### FIGURES

- 1) A description of what each colour means should be added to the caption. Is there a particular definition of what constitutes land cover change in a region e.g. a certain percentage clearance of vegetation?