

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: 19 January 2016

We thank the editor for her efforts to find reviewers, and for her comments on the paper. We respond point-by-point below in bold.

Dear authors, Thank you for your patience! I must acknowledge that it was very difficult to find reviewers for this manuscript (only one out of 12 accepted my invitation!). Hopefully, several additional comments were provided that reflect a diversity of perspectives. Your technical paper addresses a crucial topic with respect to paleoclimate data sharing. I would like you to provide us with a revised version of the manuscript which addresses the concerns of all the comments. You may be interested to exchange

C2954

with Tim Bolliet (bolliet@lsce.ipsl.fr) who has a manuscript submitted to Climate of the Past Discussion who addressed the same challenge of data sharing with a focus on stable isotope records (including web tools).

We are looking forward to reading Dr. Bolliet’s manuscript when it becomes available and look forward to contacting him to discuss how we can integrate our efforts.

I note one typo (page 4322, line 7, "foraminifera" to be corrected).

Thank you, we will correct this.

In the revised version, it would be helpful to further expand on the methods to incorporate existing records into your format, and, vice-versa, tools to extract records in your format so that they can be used by office softwares.

Agreed, we will expand on this in the text. We are also working to release a first version of utilities to interact with LiPD simultaneously with our revised manuscript.

Finally, the method chosen to report the chronological metadata is not applicable to all archives, and it would be useful to adjust it so that it can include information for ice cores (e.g. reference volcanic horizons, layer counting, thinning models, tie points...). Please account for these suggestions in the revised manuscript.

The chronology component of LiPD was designed to be flexible enough to handle all chronological methods and metadata that we could conceive of, however we recognize that this may not be clear given the example and description in the manuscript. We will expand on this in our revisions.

Sincerely, Valerie Masson-Delmotte.