

Interactive comment on “New constraints on the gas age-ice age difference along the EPICA ice cores, 0–50 kyr” by L. Loulergue et al.

E. Wolff (Editor)

ewwo@bas.ac.uk

Received and published: 3 May 2007

The two reviews make it clear that this paper, after some revision, should become publishable in CP, and I strongly urge the authors to submit a revised version to CP. The reviewers feel this is an important topic, and it clearly has very major implications. The revised version should take account of/answer all the comments of the reviewers.

I will comment on just a couple of comments by the reviewers.

Reviewer 1 made a very useful suggestion for section 5, that the authors should summarise the possible causes of the delage and deldepth difference, to let the reader know where the discussion is going. I think this would be a useful structuring of the discussion, which is quite hard for the non-expert to follow. I also appreciate the comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Interactive
Comment

regarding section 6: the statement “could well become a lead” (also in the abstract) should only be used if it can really be supported, since it is a very provocative statement (likely to be misused). Either tighten this up quantitatively (ie give a best estimate lead and an uncertainty) or avoid this statement.

Reviewer 2 questions the use of the 10Be data. I think you can explain the links you make between the sites. However, the Raisbeck paper on 10Be has recently been accepted for CPD, so you should be able more effectively to refer to that in the revised version.

Rev 2 also asks you to make a more thorough discussion of the implications of your result. I interpret this in two ways: firstly about the implications of a changed delage on lags and leads, but also you should spell out the implications on the EDC3 age scale. If i correctly understand it your conclusions eventually decide that the ice age scale should not be altered, but the gas age scale EDC3 is too young, particularly in glacial periods. This could be made clearer.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 3, 435, 2007.

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