

Sample abstract analysis R/U (correct data classification): Rating R/U (Cook), R-RR: re:look climate;

Author(s)	Reference	Cook category (abstract + title based) E – N – R/U	re:look main category (data based) NR - R	re:look sub category (data based), if R RS – RN - RR	re:look reassessment (this paper)	Details of assessment Comments / Open items
Thrasher and Sloan	Geology. Sep 2009 37 (9), 807-810.	R/U	R	RR		Eocene modelling

Title: Carbon dioxide and the early Eocene climate of western North America.

Abstract:

We present results from an early Eocene (ca. 50-56 Ma ago) regional modeling sensitivity experiment that examines **the role of atmospheric CO₂ in determining the regional climate of western North America**. This is the first paleoclimate modeling study to investigate the possible role of increased CO₂ in influencing the early Eocene climate on a regional scale. We take a regional modeling approach with the goal of using higher spatial resolution to elucidate the role of specific climate forcing mechanisms (here, CO₂) upon a region with relatively dense paleoclimate proxy data coverage. The spatial resolution of global climate models does not permit the close comparison of model results to proxy climate data in a way that helps to distinguish between regional and global climate forcings, which is a goal of this study. While our results suggest that CO₂ was most likely at least as high as 2240 ppm, this high concentration does not yield a regional climate that matches regional proxy data in all aspects. **Therefore, in combination with high atmospheric CO₂, other forcing factors must have played significant roles in defining the nature of early Eocene climate.**

Justification of Classification:

Cook: R/U: The abstract clearly states that study shows that other forcing factors (and not high atmospheric CO₂) must have played a significant role for regional Eocene climate

re:look climate: R (relevant) RR Without further analysis of the main text the Cook analysis can be transferred to the main study.

Overall re:look conclusion: Abstract analysis is not without merit: It does help to identify relevant work, but while it is suitable to identify groups and their works which explicitly state a contribution to AGW science (either pro or con) this does not give a reliable estimation of how many works are actually relevant to the question at hand.