

Interactive comment on “Variation in the Asian monsoon intensity and dry-wet condition since the Little Ice Age in central China revealed by an aragonite stalagmite” by J.-J. Yin et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 24 April 2014

All of the following aspects asked to take into account: 1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of CP? Yes. 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes, there are some novel data. 3. Are substantial conclusions reached? No. 4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? No. 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? No. 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes. 7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? No. 8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? No. 9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? No.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? No. 11. Is the language fluent and precise? No. 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Yes. 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? Yes, the Discussion section should be clarified logically and reasonably. 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? No. 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? No, in the Discussion section, there is a lack of data to support some opinions.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 10, 1305, 2014.

CPD

10, C317–C318, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C318

