

Interactive comment on “Using beryllium-10 to test the validity of past accumulation rate reconstruction from water isotope records in East Antarctic ice cores” by A. Cauquoin et al.

EW Wolff (Editor)

ew428@cam.ac.uk

Received and published: 29 September 2014

At the time of writing this editorial comment, 3 reviews have been received. However there are still a couple of weeks before the discussion period ends, so my comments should be seen as provisional.

The reviews come from 3 different areas of expertise. All of them think the paper will become worthy of publication and I encourage you to prepare a version for consideration in CP once the discussion period ends. However they all make some important points that need to be addressed. It seems to me to be especially important that you state your assumptions (dry deposition dominates) and explore how deviations from

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



this might affect your findings; and that you treat the use of ^{10}Be and water isotopes as two alternative and inexact approaches to accumulation rate, rather than using one as a test of the other.

Please respond to each substantive comment by each reviewer when preparing your author comments. I also echo the comment by Parrenin about data availability. I request that the dataset of ^{10}Be concentration at least (but preferably the derived datasets of flux as well) be placed either on the CP website as supplementary material, or at a recognised open database (NCDC palaeo, or Pangaea) with a link in the paper to where it can be found.

Thank you for submitting this paper to CPD.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 10, 3421, 2014.

CPD

10, C1590–C1591, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1591

