

Interactive comment on “Synchronisation of the EDML and EDC ice cores for the last 52 kyr by volcanic signature matching” by M. Severi et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 April 2007

General:

The authors have linked the two EPICA ice cores (EDC and EDML) over the last 52 ka using the volcanic signals, mainly the sulphate peaks. This linking of the depth scale allowed them to compare the glaciological age scale by comparing the duration between successive volcanic events. Establishing a common chronology among ice core records and still better among all paleorecords is essential for their climatological interpretation.

The authors find deviations of about 20% between the two ice core chronologies, which they attribute mainly to uncertainties in the estimates of past accumulation rates. But from the generally good agreement between the age scales especially over the glacial

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

termination they conclude that the estimate of past accumulation rates from the isotopic records is justified.

The paper is of sound scientific quality (except the conclusion on the accumulation rate estimate; see comment “p. 420, l. 13ff and p. 422, l. 6ff” below). The manuscript is clearly structured and well written.

Specific comments:

page 410, l. 25: I suggest to use “..time resolution better than ..” instead of “.. time resolution higher than ..”

p. 412, l. 4: “This implied a requirement to ..” -> “This required to ..”

p. 412, l. 10: “ .. and preserved in ice or sediment stratigraphies as, respectively, tephra layers and sulphate (and in second order acidity and conductivity) spikes.” -> “.. and preserved in ice or sediment stratigraphies as tephra layers and/or sulphate (and as a consequence acidity and conductivity) spikes.”

p. 415, l. “In the figure are also shown three known and well-dated volcanic events: the eruption of Krakatau (year of eruption 1884 A.D.), the double spikes of Tambora (1815 A.D.) and an unknown eruption 5-6 years earlier;”

There is a contradiction: three “known .. events” of which one is “ an unknown eruption..”

“In the figure are also shown ..” is not adequate beginning of the sentence because what follows is not an additional feature shown in the figure. Suggestion: “There are three well-dated volcanic events: the eruption of Krakatau (year of eruption 1884 A.D.), the double spikes of Tambora (1815 A.D.) and an unknown eruption 5-6 years earlier;”

p. 416, l. 29: “..to fill in the sections between.”-> “.. to fill in the sections inbetween.”

p. 417, l. 20: “transferring EDML depth to EDC depth and then using the EDC3 timescale.” I suggest to move “ and then using the EDC3 timescale” to the caption of

Fig.7 (e.g. “plotted on the EDC3 age scale”)

p. 419, l. 28: “(1) different glaciological settings upstream of the drilling site (higher surface elevation, possibly different origins of the precipitations, etc.)” The authors should mention here to what extent these upstream corrections have been considered in the glaciological model (or not at all?).

p. 420, l. 13ff (and p. 422, l. 6ff): “Given that these methods are virtually independent this is good proof of the applicability of the thermodynamic relationship of water vapour saturation pressure to derive past accumulation rates that can be regarded as largely representative for high resolution reconstruction of e.g fluxes of aerosol deposition ..”

This conclusion cannot be drawn like this. The chronologies are not that independent. The thermodynamical estimate of the accumulation rates are similar. The chronologies are based on common absolute time markers (which are essential for any glaciological model).

p. 420, l. 20: Define “AIM”

Fig. 2 caption: There seems something odd with the first sentence. (General comment: “sulfate (Am)” or “sulphate (Br.)”? about 50%/50% in this paper)

Fig. 3 (and p. 415, l. 26): “..in order to point out the link established between different kind of records.” What do the authors want to express with that statement? First, sulphate and DEP are anyway strongly linked, and, second, there is the EDC96/EDC99 link which has nothing to do with the main subject of this paper.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 3, 409, 2007.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)