

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

H. Goosse (Editor)

hgs@astr.ucl.ac.be

Received and published: 18 April 2007

Dear Authors,

The Referee has risen some major points about the paper.

He first considers that the introduction is "quite interesting and gives a nice overview" but he would prefer if this part was shortened. However, I can accept that the authors keep this part in the revised version as in the original manuscript. People not really interested in this review part could skip it and the ones not aware of previous work could get some useful information and references. One exception is section 3 "critic of the IPCC2001 consensus on millennial temperatures". This part is devoted to a very specific topic, difficult to follow for readers who are not familiar with previous work

and to my point of view is not clearly connected to the other parts of the manuscript even in the revised version. This section is already long compared to the other ones of the manuscript, although some parts would require some more detailed information. I consider thus, at this stage, that this discussion should be much clearer if this was let that to another paper or note specifically devoted to this subject. In agreement with the Referee, I would thus recommend that the authors strongly reduce this section and briefly mention the controversy about the "IPCC2001 consensus" in section 2.

The Referee propose also some very interesting perspectives for additional work such as using a more comprehensive set of reconstruction techniques, to use paleo-runs or to make recommendations about the use of methods for different applications. On the one hand, the authors argue that this requires a lot of additional work and I could understand their point of view. On the other hand, this additional work could be let to further studies only if the authors 'really point out the new topics of the whole discussion' as suggested by the Referee. I agree with the Referee that Section 4 should be the core of the manuscript. It contains certainly interesting information but it only represents less than 1/3 of the manuscript in the present version. It should thus be modified and the results discussed in more details. For instance, it will be necessary to justify more explicitly than in the revised version why those two techniques were selected and are representative of the different assumptions made in the past about the quality of the data (as discussed in section 2). A deeper discussion of the differences between the different reconstructions (different methods versus different data sets) would also certainly be helpful and interesting. In particular, arguments supporting the sentence in the conclusion mentioning that "the relatively simple approach of compositing all the series and using variance matching to calibrate the results give more robust estimate" should be presented in more details in section 4.

If you follow those suggestions, I think that the paper would be more focussed and easier to read.

Sincerely

Hugues Goosse

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

CPD

2, S964–S966, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S966

EGU