

## ***Interactive comment on “Changes in terrestrial carbon storage during interglacials: a comparison between Eemian and Holocene” by G. Schurgers et al.***

**N. Weber (Editor)**

weber@knmi.nl

Received and published: 16 October 2006

The main comments of both referees are indeed along the same lines. They consider the manuscript to be 'ground-breaking' (referee 1) and interesting, well-timed (referee 2). At the same time, they raise a number of serious caveats: limitations of the vegetation model LPJ, the climate model and the experimental set-up on the one hand, and criticism of the analysis of ocean carbon cycle dynamics and feedbacks between land carbon storage and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> on the other hand. The former can be addressed easily by clearly stating limitations of the present study in the revised paper. Such limitations are inherent to every model study. The latter are not quite adequately ad-

dressed. Although I do agree with the authors that reference can be made to another paper (submitted) for the analysis of ocean feedbacks, more discussion is warranted on feedbacks between land carbon storage and atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. This point seems closely related to the intriguing difference between Eemian and Holocene CO<sub>2</sub> trends, as evident from the revised figure 3. Although this question may not be answered within the present study, the authors should at least speculate on the reasons for this.

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 2, 449, 2006.

CPD

2, S474–S475, 2006

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper