

Interactive comment on “An astronomical correspondence to the 1470 year cycle of abrupt climate change” by A. M. Kelsey et al.

M.F. Loutre (Editor)

marie-france.loutre@pages.unibe.ch

Received and published: 29 January 2016

Although some comments suggest that this work is an interesting investigation, all underlined that it is weakly scientific relevant. Both scientific quality and presentation quality are rated low. Therefore I confirm my first comment that, as it states the paper does not have a standard high enough to be published in Climate of the Past. I am very much in favor of rejecting the paper although I can give it a second chance.

I read the authors response to the comments raised (both referee comments and short comments). They are unfortunately not convincing, confusing, vague and unspecific. The authors do not seem to understand that their paper is not clear, even for those who know the subject. The paper will definitely need more than ‘adjustment’ to reach

C3100

a quality level high enough for publication. Adding references will certainly not help if there is no substantial and clear explanation on how they contribute to the paper. In particular, referee underlined that old references might be prone to dating/chronology errors, which the authors do not take into account.

There is not much alternative. The authors must deeply revise their manuscript to take into account ALL the comments from the reviewers. In particular, they must recognize that even if some studies identify a 1470 yr cycle, many well-recognized scientists consider that this apparent period is coincidental. They must be more specific, more careful in the writing, more accurate. They must put a clear focus on their major message. They must provide a clear description of your methodology (equation, code).

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 11, 4895, 2015.