

Interactive comment on “Late Holocene environmental reconstructions and the implications on flood events, typhoon patterns, and agriculture activities in NE Taiwan” by L.-C. Wang et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 24 June 2014

This is an interesting study that provides some novel and significant data into the environmental change in north-eastern Taiwan for the last 1,900 years based on pollen and diatom results. In general, this will be of interest to a broad audience of late Holocene palaeoclimatologists and palaeoecologist, as well as scientists interested in human-environment relationships in East Asia. In particular, it sheds some very important light on the links between ENSO activity and the Taiwan climate, particularly drought, flood and tropical cyclone events and their influence on the NE Taiwan environment (particularly links with ENSO activity) and for key time periods such as the Little Ice Age (LIA)

C822

phase 1 from 1400 to 1620 AD, which corresponded to a dry phase, and with humid phases (and more frequent cyclone activity) observed during LIA 2 (1630 to 1850 AD) and between 500 to 700 AD. In addition, this study has also found some interesting alterations related to human occupation, particularly rice cultivation, as well as the influence of ENSO activity on this occupation phase (e.g. increase typhoon activity has a significant impact on rice cultivation). These result are of high scientific significance but the written expression is very poor and significant revision of the manuscript is required to more clearly and concisely convey the key points - there are multiple instances of poor grammar and sentence structure throughout the manuscript, so much so that the written expression has to be completely reworked (i.e. I would have at least five to six comments for every page of the manuscript in terms of suggested grammar improvements) that I feel the authors need to rewrite the document so that I can more accurately assess the scientific significance (which I feel is good) and in particular the scientific quality, i.e. I feel that the approaches and methods are valid and the authors have developed a sound interpretation of the results in their discussion, but it is hard to make a clear determination of this due to the poor English expression. Although, I do feel their figures are of a suitable quality and clearly/accurately summarize the data.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 10, 1977, 2014.

C823