

Global warming of 1.5°C

An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty

Response to Expert Review: Instructions to Authors

The chapter writing teams must consider all expert review comments and record their agreed responses. Coordinating Lead Authors may wish to organize discussions of general comments, and ones with broad implications for the chapter, among the whole author team. Responsibilities for responding to specific comments may be allocated to appropriate authors within the team, but all recorded responses will be taken to represent agreement of the team as a whole.

Responses should be brief, address all issues raised in a particular review comment, and any action taken in response to the comment should be unambiguous. A few examples of common responses are given below. These examples are provided as a resource in support of the editorial process and are not intended to be exhaustive of all possible responses. Examples provided are optional and are not intended to be used as a default. For many comments, chapter teams will need to elaborate on the examples to provide a complete response.

Examples of common responses:

Noted

This response will be used only in case of remarks, where no text revision is required

Editorial – copyedit to be completed prior to publication

This response may be used, e.g., in the case of typographical, grammatical, stylistic suggestions

Taken into account

This response will require additional notation; some examples include:

Taken into account - combined with other comment

Taken into account - covered in Section X.X

Taken into account - text revised [with additional explanation]

Accepted

This response may or may not require additional explanation; some examples include:

Accepted – text revised (e.g., in the case of minor modifications)

Accepted – [with additional explanation] (e.g., where more substantive modifications are required in response to the comments) In some cases it will be necessary to state how the changes to the draft differ from those suggested by the reviewer.

Rejected

This response always requires an explanation. The reasons for rejection must be explicit; some examples include:

Rejected - beyond the mandate of [WGI with additional explanation] (e.g., refers to adaption, economics, mitigation)

Rejected - outside the scope of the chapter [with additional explanation] (e.g., topic covered in Chapter X)

Rejected - not supported by the peer-reviewed published literature

Rejected – no scientific evidence/publication provided to support changes suggested by the reviewer

Rejected – [with additional explanation/scientific reasoning]

Not Applicable

This response may be used when a chapter has been shortened/edited so that the subject of the review comment is no longer part of the chapter:

Not Applicable - [section] no longer included in the chapter