

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

M. N. Juckes et al.

Received and published: 6 March 2007

Eschenbach, first review (cpd-2-s715_p)

(A) The Durbin-Watson test deals with the autocorrelation of residuals not the significance of the correlation. The switch in sign of the Chesapeake bay data was an error. The statement of significance is using standard statistical terminology.

(B) As the reviewer notes, the Biondi et al. paper introduces no new evidence for CO₂ fertilization of pine. Recent literature suggests that this is probably a minor issue.

(C) We will explicitly state that we are using publically available data in the revision.

Eschenbach, second review (cpd-2-s720_p)

(C cont.) The date selection rule will be modified to be only proxies extending from

AD1000 to 1980. As noted above, previous use of proxies does not rule out using them again.

(D) We are not supporting the terminology used by Mann et al. The conclusion describes the relation between estimated temperature anomalies and the standard error of the fit to calibration data.

Eschenbach, third review (cpd-2-s724_p)

(D cont.) We assume that the sensitivity of the proxy composite is stable, not that the temperature itself is stable. The correlation of individual proxies with local temperature are clearly compromised by the fact that individual proxies have a signal to noise ratio less than unity. The choice of normalisation would ideally be determined by estimates of the signal to noise ratio of the individual proxies and of the noise autocorrelation function (which is clearly not the same as the time series auto-correlation function). Since these things are not known, the best choice is to normalise all proxies to unit variance.

(E) The model assumes there is a linear dependence in the composite, not in the individual proxies.

(F) We refer to peer reviewed material published by independent journals, we do not aim to review all "important documents".

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper