

Interactive comment on “On the variability of return periods of European winter precipitation extremes over the last five centuries” by A. Pauling and H. Paeth

J. Guiot (Editor)

guiot@cerege.fr

Received and published: 1 June 2006

This paper presents an analysis of precipitation reconstructions published recently (Climate Dynamics), in the perspective of return period of extreme years. The reconstructions have been found as robust (in the above mentioned paper) and it is important to have longer time-series than existing instrumental series. It is then a good opportunity and in this respect, this paper is important. I am asking several questions about results and methodology: the error done on the reconstructions is not constant in time. It is higher for earlier periods because of lack of good quality proxies. Is it taken properly in the extreme analysis? Is it possible to do that? Another point is: the fact that usu-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

ally there is a risk of reconstructing series of lower variance when the proxies are less numerous has the risk to introduce non stationarity of 2nd order, which will have an effect on the extremes. Is it properly taken into account? I am curious to have more information from the authors about these points

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 2, 157, 2006.

CPD

2, S97–S98, 2006

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper