I have been requested by the editors to comment briefly on the issues address by this paper, which represents a useful contribution to the literature. I have four short points:

1. Not enough SCC estimates are reported with risk premia (let alone ambiguity premia). Given the inherent importance of uncertainty to a problem such as climate change, this is surprising. For this reason alone, the paper is a welcome addition.

2. Indeed, it is not uncommon to see papers reporting **median** SCC estimates, instead of **mean** estimates. Given that most damage estimates are right skewed, reporting the median rather than the mean is likely to be inappropriate. (In theory it is not necessary that right-skewness implies mean > median, but it appears to hold, in practice, in this area).

3. An early (and preliminary) study into the impacts of risk and ambiguity on the SCC was conducted by Oxford MSc student, Ada Li, in 2004. Her MSc theses is posted online: http://www.cameronhepburn.com/Li%282004%29.pdf

4. More recently, and more rigorously, Millner at al. (2011) provide an indication of how substantial the size of the ambiguity premium might be, see: http://www.nber.org/papers/w16050.pdf