

Interactive comment on “Direct North-South synchronization of abrupt climate change recording in ice cores using beryllium 10” by G. M. Raisbeck et al.

F. Parrenin (Editor)

parrenin@ujf-grenoble.fr

Received and published: 13 August 2007

The authors addressed successfully the main remarks of the reviewers, and the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

I have one major remark concerning the introduction, plus other minor editorial comments.

The introduction could be reorganized in my opinion. This is not critical, of course, and I just invite the authors to consider improving it if they feel it can improve the attractiveness of their article: - I would describe all the past synchro work using gas records before describing Be10. Between both parts, insert the 2nd paragraph of p.

S525

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

3 which is rather strange in the current introduction. - p. 2, 2nd paragraph: the Be10 peak is introduced, but too shortly for the unfamiliar readers to understand. Then it is described in more details p. 3 (3rd paragraph and beginning of 4th paragraph). I would suggest to move this description before the description of the past work related to Be10. - p. 2, last paragraph: I would suggest describing the work using $d_{18O_{atm}}$ before describing the work using methane.

Minor comments:

- intro, l. 7: use parentheses instead of brackets.
- p. 2, l. 2: 'ice age - gas age uncertainty' -> 'ice age - gas age difference (Delta-age)'
- p. 2, l. 7: 'The advantage of this method...' Not really true as it is written now: Be10 concentrations depend on accu rates and thus on climate.
- p. 2, l. 11: missing space before bracket.
- p. 2, 8 lines from the end: Ref should be 'Caillon et al., 2001', not 'Caillon et al., 2003'.
- p. 3, last paragraph: it seems strange that the Laschamp event is not mentioned here. I would also suggest mentioning it in the abstract.
- p. 4, l. 7: Missing dot after '9 years'.
- p. 5, l. 2: You reference [EPICA community members, 2004] for the accumulation rates, but you mention [Parrenin et al., 2007] in the caption of Fig. 1. Which one has been used?
- p. 6: the first paragraph is already interpretation, and may be moved to the beginning of section 4.
- caption Fig. 1, last line: '(AIM)' is redundant and may be removed.
- caption of Fig. 3: Final dot missing.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 3, 755, 2007.

CPD

3, S525–S527, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S527

EGU