

Interactive comment on “On the verification of climate reconstructions” by G. Bürger and U. Cubasch

G. Bürger and U. Cubasch

Received and published: 8 July 2006

As an example, only this: For the AD 1400 network the NH verification RE is reported a) by MBH98 as 0.51 and b) by Rutherford et al., 2005 using RegEM as 0.40 (0.46 for the hybrid).

So as $b < a$, RegEM is worse than MBH98, no? The same inequality holds for the AD 1500 network.

All this is not very important. What is important is the following: Reviewer, why did you compare the AD 1500 network of MBH98 with the AD 1400 network of RegEM? (You cannot seriously pick minimum RE values from the tables and compare them across centuries.)

If you would kindly answer this single question?

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 2, 357, 2006.

CPD

2, S171–S172, 2006

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S172

EGU