

***Interactive comment on “The effects of past climate variability on fire and vegetation in the cerrão savanna ecosystem of the Huanchaca Mesetta, Noel Kempff Mercado National Park, NE Bolivia” by S. Y. Maezumi et al.***

**S. Y. Maezumi et al.**

shira.maezumi@gmail.com

Received and published: 29 March 2015

Thank you to the reviewers and editor for your helpful comments. The reviewers suggestions were incorporated and when applicable, new/revised figures were made. Please see attached.

RESPONSE TO: D. Urrego (Editor) d.urrego@exeter.ac.uk. Received and published: 6 March 2015

Comments: Please address in particular concerns regarding the zonation of phytolith

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



data, and provide additional detail on the classification analysis used.

SYM: An additional zone (Zone 5) was added along with a clarification on the use of CONISS vs CCA analysis.

It would be useful to include a short description on the use of constrained cluster analysis in the Materials & Methods section, including relevant details on distance measure and linking method.

SYM: More detail on CONISS was added to the methodology.

Both CONISS (Fig. 3) and CCA (Results) are used as acronyms for the cluster analysis, but CCA may create confusion as this is often used for canonical correspondence analysis. Please also address questions on the development of the chronology and double check the reference for the IntCal13 calibration dataset.

SYM: more detail was added to the construction of the age model in the methods section and appropriate references were added for IntCal13.

Additionally, both reviewers suggest a number of format changes including the length of the title, use of acronyms, the reference list and Figures. SYM: Reviewers comments were included into the revised version of the manuscript and the title was shortened as suggested by Dr. Hooghiemstra.

I would also like to see an improved version of Figure 1 that uses the space more efficiently, maybe by enlarging the pictures and reducing the blank space.

SYM: I have revised figure 1 by enlarging pictures to eliminate blank space.

RESPONSE TO: H. Hooghiemstra (Referee) h.hooghiemstra@uva.nl Received and published: 18 February 2015

Comments: I have penciled many corrections and improvements in the text: I have uploaded a scan of the annotated manuscript which is part of this review report. I assume the authors will make the corrections as indicated. In the text below I focus on

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



a selection of issues that I will explain in more detail:

- Title: The title is very long and is a burden for all that like to make reference to this paper. A shortened version with the same content could read as follows: “Effects of past climate variability on fire and vegetation in the cerrado savanna of the Huanchaca Mesetta, NE Bolivia”.

SYM: The title has been changed to the above as suggested.

25: There is an essential difference between ‘prediction’ and ‘projection’. IPCC reports make projections (if unclear, please ask for my class room slide).

SYM: This correction was made throughout the manuscript.

31: Geological formations are written with caps (e.g. Lower, Middle, and Upper Mekkelhorst Member) whereas intervals of time are written in lower case (e.g. early, middle, and late Holocene). Corrections are needed all over the manuscript.

SYM: Throughout the manuscript, Early changed to early, Middle to middle, and Late to late

40: In Latin America is very usual to use komma’s in ages below 10,000. However, there is no need to do so. Please omit all komma’s in ages below 10,000 all over the manuscript (saves much space)

SYM: All commas were removed on numbers less than 10,000.

119: ‘cal yr BP’ is a unit. As units are not abbreviations no points should be used. Thus “B.P” and “B.P.” should be corrected into “BP” all over the manuscript (saves another time much space and improves readability)

SYM: B.P. and B.P were replaced with BP throughout the manuscript.

257: On page 43 I have monitored where acronyms have been first introduced: corrections are needed in lines 257, 271, and 281. Figure 6 is not in sequence and should

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

be re-numbered.

SYM: 257: corrected, 271: ITCZ first introduced on line 84. Changed throughout document. 281: LOI first ref. on line 142, changed throughout doc. Reordered Figure 6 and 7.

305: cc is not a unit of the metric system: cm<sup>3</sup> should be used.

SYM: Changed to cm<sup>3</sup> in the document

320: I am confused by reading this sentence. I guess you mean 'charcoal influx' which has the unit "particles cm<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup>".

SYM: Reworded to charcoal influx for clarification.

393: a confusing situation here: because you write "Late Glacial" instead of "Lateglacial" (compare Pleniglacial), it seems that "Late" should be written here in lower case. However, "Late Glacial" is a geological interval of time and, therefore, correctly written with a cap. To be consequent with Pleniglacial, beter to write "Lateglacial". It should be kept in mind that each glacial of the Pleistocene has a 'late glacial' (not "Late Glacial") interval, but not a "Lateglacial" as the latter is restricted to the interval of ca. 15,000-11,500 cal yr BP !

SYM: Changed to Lateglacial throughout the document

- The list of references shows many mistakes, and inconsequent use of issue numbers of journals. In the current electronic era, issue numbers are not relevant any more. A book reference always should mention: publisher, city, and country.

SYM: I have reformatted all references to exclude issue number for journals and added publisher, city and country for any book cictations.

1028: Indeed Dutch names such as "T. van der Hammen" may cause problems. Always insert the author under "V", not under "H". According to the rules of Dutch language the correct spelling is "van der Hammen, T". However, to serve the foreign reader I always

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



write “Van der Hammen, T.” to make clear that the family name should not be split up. Thus, in line 1028 “. . . and Drecht, G. Van” should read as “. . . and Van Drecht, G”.

SYM: Correction Made in the reference list.

Table 1: give the last column a unit.

SYM: Correction made

Fig. 2: along the X-axis ‘cal BP’ = ‘cal yr BP’ Delete all “cal yr BP” along the curve.

SYM: Corrections made

Fig. 3: Give the X-axis a unit. SYM: Added Pollen percentage data on the X-axis

Fig. 4 Show the unit above the column of ages, and delete the unit after each dated sample.

SYM: Made a header of Age cal yr BP

Records c, d, and e are missing the unit in which values are expressed.

SYM: Values added to each axis

Fig. 5: Curve (a):  $D_{13}C = \delta_{13}C$

SYM: Proper delta notation added for Carbon and Nitrogen

Fig. 6: figure caption and on top figure: charcoal accumulation = charcoal influx. at curves a) and c): Particle/cm<sup>2</sup>/yr = particles cm<sup>-2</sup> yr<sup>-1</sup> at curve e) Fire Episodes per 1000years<sup>-1</sup> = Fire episodes 1000 yr<sup>-1</sup> (mind that “per” is equivalent to “<sup>-1</sup>”)

SYM: Changes Made to captions

Fig. 7: same corrections needed as in previous figures Curve J showing insolation: W/M<sup>2</sup> = W m<sup>-2</sup>

SYM: Changes Made to captions

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



RESPONSE TO: B.S. Whitney (Referee) bronwen.whitney@northumbria.ac.uk Received and published: 2 March 2015

GENERAL COMMENTS The title is a little clunky and I would reconsider the depth of geographical detail provided here. SYM: Title was shorted as suggested by Dr. Hooghiemstra.

I have a few suggestions/corrections to make with respect to the discussion and the presentation of the stable isotope data. My greatest concern is the zonation of the phytolith data (see 'Specific Comments'), which influences interpretation of key transition points. I would like to see that the zonation changed or my concerns addressed in a response from the authors. SYM: The comments are addressed below.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS 2. Materials and Methods 2.2. Chronology: Please provide further details of the options adopted in the creation of the age-model in CLAM; for example, what options, such as the age estimations, were selected in the creation of the model? Does the grey shading in Figure 2 represent two-sigma error?

SYM: I have added more detail on the creation of the age-model in the methods section including the use of 2 sigma error (indicated by grey bars in Figure 2).

2.7. Phytoliths: Please clarify how the phytolith sums were calculated. i.e., were percentages of non-Mauritia phytoliths calculated on the basis of the total sum of phytoliths excluding Mauritia?

SYM: I have added a clarifying sentence stating: Percentages of non-Mauritia phytoliths were calculated on the basis of the total sum of phytoliths

3. Results: Zonation of phytolith data: There are several points about the zoning methodology that I find unclear and/or problematic. Firstly, it is stated that the zones were determined by constrained correspondence analysis (CCA), but the authors do not indicate what environmental variable constrained the analysis. It is possible that CONISS is meant here, given that a dendrogram is provided with the phytolith data.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



SYM: CONISS , not CCA was used. The text was changed to clarify in line 395.

Secondly, if CONISS was the clustering method chosen to create the zones, the authors have not chosen the divisions that create the lowest dispersion within each cluster (often chosen by drawing a straight line at a given height of the hierarchical tree, see Grimm [1987]). From the dendrogram provided, and assuming that the authors intended that minimized dispersion was the goal of the zonation exercise, the order of the zonation divides should be as follows:

First order : boundary between zones 3 and 4, as is currently designated SYM: Left as previously designated.

Second order : within zone 4, around 2 kyr BP SYM: Added another zone at 2ka (Zone 5)

Third order : boundary between zones 2 and 3, as is currently designated SYM: Left as designated

The zone boundary between Zones 1 and 2 is of a lower order than further divisions within Zone 3 (ca. 4500 yrs BP) and Zone 4 (ca. 1800 yrs BP).

Finally, was the number of recognized zones determined by any statistical methods, such as a broken stick model? Grimm, E.C. (1987) Computers and Geosciences, 13: 13-35 SYM: We added the use a broken stick model to determine that there were 5 significant zones. The additional of this analysis was added to the methods section and reflected in the additional of Zone 5 into the results section.

Zones 3.1 – 3.4: The authors have presented a considered and nuanced interpretation of the climatic, ecological, edaphic and altitudinal controls on fire and vegetation on the mesetta. My only concern is the relative changes to fire frequency shown throughout the record. Although charcoal accumulation shows some fairly larges shifts, I question whether the range of 2-5 fire events per 1000 yrs is a significant shift in the palaeofire record? How does this compared to other sites in similar vegetation assemblages?

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

SYM: As this is one of the first high resolution charcoal records from the Cerrado savanna, there are not existing records in similar vegetation assemblages in the region to compare it to. However, in ecosystems in North America an increase from 2-5 episodes is considered an important change in paleofire activity. It is important to note here, that the FRI does not represent an isolated fire “event”, rather is the FRI represents episodes (defined as periods of increased burning). In this case an increase from 2 to 5 periods of increased burning over a 1000 yr period is a significant change in the paleofire record, particularly when there is not a significant change in the vegetation record.

Page 152, lines 1-2: Please rewrite. I find this sentence difficult to follow. SYM: Sentence was rewritten

Discussion: Pg. 156, ca. In 5: Give references for Late Glacial climate change. SYM: References added

Pg. 157, This is an excellent discussion of possible climate drivers of changes in *Mauritia* abundance. However, the estimated of the temperature increase reported in Whitney et al. (2011) is 19,500 yrs BP, not 15,900 yrs BP, as indicated in twice in this section. I’d also like to add that the vegetation shift reported in the Pantanal probably reflects a threshold response (such as the removal of regular frosts), so I support the authors’ interpretation of potentially cooler temperatures in the Late Glacial, as explained by higher frequency surazos (Bush and Silman 2004), despite the erroneous citation.

SYM: The error was corrected from 15,900 to 19,500 yrs BP.

Pg. 159, Ln 3: The insolation minimum occurred ca. 12,000 yrs BP, not in the mid-Holocene as indicated. Although increasing precipitation in the late Holocene has been linked to increasing insolation in the southern hemisphere during the austral summer, the opposite pattern does not hold true for the transition into the Holocene.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)



SYM: This sentence was removed from the discussion.

Pg. 162, Ln 22: Maize pollen was recovered from sediments dating to ca. AD 940 to AD 1700, not yrs BP as indicated, and only in L. Chaplin, not L. Bella Vista. Many apologies if the dates I provided were unclear. Please amend to 1000 to 400 cal yr BP.

SYM: Amended the sentence to reflect the correct dates.

Figures: Figure 4. It would be helpful if you specified in the caption that the zones are derived from the phytolith data.

SYM: This was added to each of the figure captions

Figure 5. The stratigraphic presentation of stable isotope data makes it difficult for the reader to interpret the data, given they need to consider a combination of variables to determine the source of the carbon. I would like to see bivariate plots of stable isotope data (i.e.,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  v. C:N) to show the organic source matter. The zones can be displayed by using different plotting symbols for each zone (such as shown in Cordon et al. (2005), for an example).

SYM: An additional figure was created plotting C:N ratios against  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values using different colors for each zone.

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS 1.4 Vegetation: Section 25: Many of those families are not true grasses, is 'Monocot families' meant here? Or perhaps, 'Families of the order Poales' is meant (with the exception of Orchidaceae). Correct the spelling of Orchidaceae, Eriocaulaceae, and Rapateaceae. SYM: Change to Monocot families. Spelling Corrections Made.

References: I haven't checked through the citation list thoroughly, but I did notice the following were missing from the list: Mittermeier et al. (2000) Perdue and Koprivnjak (2007) Smith et al. (1997). SYM: Checked all references added missing references listed above.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.clim-past-discuss.net/11/C169/2015/cpd-11-C169-2015-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 11, 135, 2015.

**CPD**

11, C169–C184, 2015

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C178



Interactive  
Comment




Fig. 1.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive  
Comment




Fig. 2.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper




[Interactive  
Comment](#)

Fig. 3.

C181

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)


[Interactive  
Comment](#)

Fig. 4.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)


[Interactive Comment](#)

Fig. 5.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)




Fig. 6.