

## ***Interactive comment on “Palaeo sea-level and ice-sheet databases: problems, strategies and perspectives” by A. Düsterhus et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 9 October 2015

#### General Comments:

The topic of this report that highlights the necessity of creating comprehensive paleo-sea-level and ice-sheets data bases is important for the paleo-community and likely to other end users. However, the manuscript emphasizes the needs and specifics for such data bases in extremely vague terms. It is not clear to this reviewer which would be in the authors' view be the ideal structure of a data base sought by the paleo-community. Authors are often referring to the PALSEA community and their strategy in designing a standardized data base, but failed to show how this model is taken to the level of what they would like to accomplish with their new proposal. Including a table or data base structure (using a discipline specific approach) in their paper would greatly improve the readability of the manuscript, providing the final target. It is important that authors

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



---

[Interactive  
Comment](#)

clarifies among others, what is their operational time scale? This is an essential point that need to be considered when creating a data base as the complexity of information diminishes somehow deeper in time. For example, ice-sheet data for LGM are likely much more abundant compare to those for mid-Pliocene Warm Period.

Creating useful and workable cross-disciplinary data bases is challenging and authors should have placed more emphasize on what would be the best structure that will serve various paleo-communities. Instead they spent a good amount of space persuading the reader on how essential such data bases are. Unfortunately, doing so, the paper is missing the guiding line and its internal organization is lacking. I suggest the sections are re-arranged and maybe discussed starting from the 3 distinct phases (measurement, documentation, and interpretation), each of them presented in details, with discipline specific examples (maybe make use of tables). Many statements and paragraphs throughout the manuscript appear in sections with which they are not really connected (see the annotated pdf file). These need to be revised and placed at their right places.

Although manuscript's topic (sea-level, ice sheets) is of interest to the Climate of the Past journal's audience, its content does not really make it for a regular article. Would this be considered a Short Report, Rapid Communication, Technical Note? All of these would be more appropriate, if accepted, than being considered a regular science paper. Regardless the type of contribution, I feel the report I reviewed needs some major revisions in order to make it of significant use to the paleo-community and beyond.

Other comments:

See the attached annotated pdf file

Detailed points

See the attached annotated pdf file

[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/C1945/2015/cpd-11-C1945-2015-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 11, 2389, 2015.

**CPD**

11, C1945–C1947, 2015

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1947

