

Interactive comment on “Technical Note: The Linked Paleo Data framework – a common tongue for paleoclimatology” by N. P. McKay and J. Emile-Geay

N. P. McKay and J. Emile-Geay

nicholas.mckay@nau.edu

Received and published: 18 January 2016

We thank Jack for taking the time to provide his input and support for this effort. Please see our answers below in bold.

Reviewer 1 raises important points - can LiPD be a common format if it doesn't yet have buy-in from the community? There is a risk of proliferation of standards (see this cartoon: <https://xkcd.com/927/>) Of course, the paleoclimate community is dispersed across countries and proxies, so getting actual full community buy-in is impossible. And our community doesn't have any groups charged with setting community standards for paleoclimatic data - although NOAA Paleoclimatology, PANGAEA, and Neotoma (for

C2944

paleoecological data) come close.

That said, I think this paper takes an important step forward. There is a need for standard data formats that can be used to pass paleoclimatic data among databases, to gather data into paleoclimatic syntheses, and to export to analytical environments such as R. This paper is an appropriate place to propose such a format. Whether the format gains widespread adoption and/or modification is still to be determined.

Some of Reviewer 1's concerns might be addressed if the purpose of LiPD was clarified. I agree with Reviewer 1 that LiPD would not be a very good data entry format. The concerns about csv format are important.

We strongly agree that we need to be explicit about the purpose of LiPD, and our vision about user's workflow and how scientist will interact with the format. We will include this in our revised manuscript.

Still, my sense is that the needs here are for textual revision (rethinking csv format and scaling back claims that this is already a community data format), rather than outright rejection. Climates of the Past seems like the natural place for this article. -Jack Williams

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 11, 4309, 2015.