

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 #1

Received and published: 27 April 2007

Firstly, this is a useful piece of work and should be published, however, I recommend the manuscript should be rewritten before it is accepted for publication. It was difficult to read with bad English expression, and therefore difficult to review (see below for examples). I suggest it should be reworded by an English speaking co-author or other (and this comment is not directed specifically at the first author). I suspect some of the co-authors did not read this paper prior to submission. I fully understand that there are often very good reasons for this, but I think large groups, such as EPICA, should have a publications policy to ensure a minimum submission standard.

My initial thoughts were that synchronisation should be straightforward, however the plot of delta age ratio R (Figure 8) shows that producing a common timescale is difficult and modelling alone would result in a 20% error in synchrony (if I have that correct?

I'm not a modeller). Another interesting observation is that there are not many volcanic signals during the transition (Figure 4). A similar synchronisation should now be done for all Antarctic cores – it could reveal more about accumulation histories.

As I mentioned upfront, there is bad expression throughout the manuscript – I'll just point out the occurrence in the abstract and a few examples elsewhere, however the manuscript needs a full reword:

Abstract

Line 4 ('was carried on by', 'between this core and the one drilled at'), Line 6 ('was build'), Line 9 ('was turned into'), Line 12 ('within 20% in the estimate'), Line 13 ('At this step our approach is not able to unequivocally find out which of the models is affected by the errors'), Line 17 ('which may be different at present day and in the past').

Another couple of examples of bad expression:

Page 2 Introduction Line 6. 'The possibility ... in the ice'.

Page 3 Line 12. 'Despite these efforts Presented in this issue'

Page 3 6th Line from end 'This implied ...'

Page 3 4th Line from end 'Volcanic signatures ... spikes'

Page 4 Line 5 'On the other hand ... Wolff et al., 2005)'

Page 5 Lines 2-6

Figure caption for Figure 6.

There are a lot more examples of bad expression throughout but I must also mention the entire Page 10 – I cannot follow what you are saying – please clear up your message.

Other comments on the paper:

Page 2 4th line from bottom of abstract – you don't make an assumption 'correct', you make the assumption then present your interpretation based on this assumption

Be careful when referring to 'ice cores' – be specific. There are many examples where it is not clear which core you are referring to – eg Abstract Page 2 Line 4, Page 3 Line 16, Page 5 Line 19 'both the EPICA cores' and 'Both cores' – which ones be specific? (You mentioned 4 cores in the para above). Page 6 Line 1. Page 6, 8th line from end.

Consistency with dates – eg you use both kyr B.P. (e.g. Figure 3) and A.D. (Figure 2) – be consistent throughout the manuscript.

Page 7 Line 4. I'm not sure what you mean by problems finding markers in the brittle ice?

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper