

Interactive comment on “On the quality of climate proxies derived from newspaper reports – a case study” by D. Gallego et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 24 September 2007

The paper makes an important contribution by demonstrating the value of newspapers as sources of meteorological and climatological information. It is scientifically sound and fits well into the scope of "Climate of the Past".

The main problem I have with the paper is that the scope of the analysis it not always made clear. What is done in the paper is not a calibration and also not a validation in a strict sense. The authors express that their approach is not a calibration, but they do this only in the second last paragraph of the paper. This leads to confusion. For instance, they write in the abstract: "The methodology developed can help to validate reconstructed series in the absence of instrumental data to perform a direct calibration." Maybe "test of consistency" would be a more appropriate term. I do see the power of their approach, but if it is used for calibration (or also validation, strictly) it

creates a dependence between the local variable and the large-scale circulation. If no instrumental data are available for direct calibration and large-scale circulation data are used for validation, is the product really still a reconstruction of local snow fall? Or does it become a reconstruction of the strength/position of the jet? This problem should be dealt with in the paper because it is easy to fall into the trap of circular reasoning when using the reconstruction for certain applications.

Minor points:

p. 979, l 27: "dynamics of the Suthern Hemisphere" should probably be "atmospheric dynamics..."

p. 984, l. 6: "and the vertical of the SF site". I don't understand the sentence.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 3, 977, 2007.

CPD

3, S588–S589, 2007

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper