

Interactive comment on “Impacts of a lengthening open water season on Alaskan coastal communities” by Rebecca J. Rolph et al.

G. Ljubicic (Referee)

gitaljubicic@cunet.carleton.ca

Received and published: 30 November 2017

- Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of TC? Yes.
- Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes.
- Are substantial conclusions reached? They need to be better supported.
- Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? See comments in attached .pdf.
- Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? See comments in attached .pdf.
- Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to

C1

allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? In relation to HSIA analysis, yes. In others, need to be better supported.

- Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes, but could be better referenced.
- Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes.
- Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes.
- Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes, but needs a bit more context in places.
- Is the language fluent and precise? Yes.

Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? N/A

- Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? See comments in attached .pdf.

Are the number and quality of references appropriate? See comments in attached .pdf.

Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? Yes.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.the-cryosphere-discuss.net/tc-2017-211/tc-2017-211-RC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2017-211>, 2017.

C2