

Interactive comment on “Millennial temperature reconstruction intercomparison and evaluation” by M. N. Juckes et al.

E. Willis

willis@taunovobay.com

Received and published: 4 November 2006

First, transparency in general. Martin, thank you for your correction to your claim that Steve McIntyre had not provided code.

I was astounded, however, that you would single him out for comment on this matter when your co-authors have been much worse transgressors.

Despite various requests, Briffa, for example, has never identified the sites in Briffa et al. 2001. These sites have been used in six further studies, again without identification.

Moberg at first refused to reveal his data. Then, after Science Magazine made a request, he provided incomplete data, and has since refused to provide more.

Esper has failed to provide a replicable account of his methodology.

These are not personal insults, they are statements of fact. These have all been well documented, and yet you ignore them and single out Steve McIntyre. Your own "Comments on Disclosure" says:

=====

"all research benefits from full and open access to published datasets and that a clear explanation of analytical methods is mandatory".

=====

As the studies for which your co-authors have refused to provide datasets and analytical methods are among those reviewed in your current "Millennial temperature" paper, surely this must be relevant to any analysis you make of them.

Next, transparency in regards to proxy selection. For any multi-proxy reconstruction to have statistical weight, the proxies must be selected according to a priori rules. Otherwise, as some authors seem to have done, proxies are simply selected because they agree with the authors' point of view.

What were your criteria for proxy selection? I do not find any explanation of this in your paper. You are using 10 of the 18 proxies used by Moberg ... why did you not use the other 8?

For example, I note that you have included the Arabian Sea: Globigerina bulloides proxy, but not the Sargasso Sea dO18 proxy. And that you have included the Yamal proxy, but not the Indigirka, Siberia proxy. Why?

Replacing just these two proxies out of the 18 selected gives a vastly different result, negating your claim of "robustness". (See <http://www.climateaudit.org/?p=887> for a graph and discussion of the difference) Your test for "robustness" consists of deleting one proxy at a time to see if it makes a difference. As this example shows, your test is

not comprehensive enough for the job.

In short, because you have not specified your proxy selection criteria, and because the results are quite sensitive to proxy selection, your paper is not scientifically robust as it stands.

Any comments greatly appreciated,

w.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 2, 1001, 2006.

CPD

2, S536–S538, 2006

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper