

Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., author comment AC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2022-92-AC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on CEC1

Qianjiao Wu et al.

Author comment on "An Improved Algorithm for Simulating Surface Flow Dynamics based on the Flow-Path Network Model" by Qianjiao Wu et al., Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2022-92-AC1>, 2022

Dear Editor,

Thanks for all of the comments and suggestions for our submission GMD-2022-92. We have carefully examined the comment in the interactive discussion of its preprint, and revised the manuscript accordingly. Detailed correction is listed below point by point.

Specific comments:

First, the section reads: "The code still needs to be improved and will be updates when it's perfect". First, it does not exist such a thing as the perfect code, so such a statement does not make sense. Secondly, the role of such section and repository is not to promote your preferred webpage, the web of a project or link to the newest version of a model but to assure the replicability of your work. To be clear, nobody cares here about an improved and better version of your software but the one you have used for your work and mentioned in the manuscript. Therefore, please, remove this statement and include the DOI of the current Zenodo repository in any reviewed version of your manuscript.

Response: Thanks for the comments. According to the comments, we have removed the statement ("The code still needs to be improved and will be updates when it's perfec") and included the DOI of the current Zenodo repository. In the revised manuscript, we have changed the section of Code Availability (P25, L480).

Secondly, the Readme file in the Zenodo repository instructs the user to get code from a GitHub repository. We can not accept this. GitHub is not a suitable repository and instructs authors to use other alternatives for long-term archival and publishing. I guess you refer to the Zenodo repository, so instead of the GitHub repository, use the one of Zenodo.

Response: Thanks for the comments. According to the comments, we have revised the Readme file in the Zenodo repository which refers to the Zenodo repository instead of the GitHub repository. In addition, the DOI will be acquired after the code had been archived into the Zenodo repository. So, we have only provided the method to download the code in the Readme file instead of its DOI which have been updated in the revised manuscript.

Third, the Readme file mentions the need to use several proprietary technologies, such as Visual Studio and Cuda 8.0. It is a shame that the replicability of your work is compromised by using non-libre software. Also, you include several binary files .exe, so verifying their code is impossible. This makes me guess that your software could only run on specific (also non-free) operative systems, such as Windows. However, there is no information about OS requirements in your work. You must clarify all these details in the manuscript.

Response: Thanks for the comments. Our software can only run on the Windows operate system which have supplemented in the revises manuscript.

Finally, although the Zenodo repository states that the software license is "Other (Open)" in the files contained, there is no license file that identifies it. If you do not include a license, the code continues to be your property and can not be used by others, despite any statement on being free to use. Therefore, when uploading the model's code to the repository, you could want to choose a free software/open-source (FLOSS) license. We recommend the GPLv3. You only need to include the file '<https://www.gnu.org/licenses/gpl-3.0.txt>' as LICENSE.txt with your code. Also, you can choose other options that Zenodo provides: GPLv2, Apache License, MIT License, etc.

Response: Thanks for the comments. We have uploaded a LICENSE.txt with the code into the Zenodo repository according to the GPLv3.