

## ***Interactive comment on “Dendroclimatology in Fennoscandia – from past accomplishments to future potentials” by H. W. Linderholm et al.***

**A. Moberg (Editor)**

anders.moberg@natgeo.su.se

Received and published: 6 September 2009

Dear authors,

The reviewers have considered that you have presented a rather comprehensive review of dendroclimatology in Fennoscandia, but they have also pointed out weaknesses in this review and in your discussion of past achievements. You have, indeed, already indicated in your Author Comment that you are prepared to revise the paper following the reviewers' suggestions.

Some review comments have concerned the suitability of a review paper like this in Climate of the Past. Given that the paper in question is a contribution to a special issue focussing on Holocene climate variability over Scandinavia, I would say that a

C646

review of dendroclimatological data is highly motivated provided that previous results are discussed and analysed critically. In particular, in context of this particular special issue, I would recommend that a revised version should include a somewhat extended discussion of all available multi-millennial long dendroclimatological temperature reconstructions from Fennoscandia (with all available such long series shown in figures) and their potential limitation and advantages compared to other types of multi-millennial proxy series from the same region. The question of whether climate low-frequency variability at multi-century and millennial scales can be preserved in tree rings and how the long-term trends (or absence of trends) seen in multi-millennial tree-ring records shall be interpreted is of high interest here.

I would also like to re-emphasize the reviewers' plea for a more fair all-Fennoscandian analysis, with less bias towards Swedish investigations, as you have indeed already accepted in your Author Comment.

Finally, I encourage the authors, after a major revision, to submit a review paper on dendroclimatology in Scandinavia, which should include some more clear recommendations of important future research directions from the authors' point of view. The revised paper will be sent out for peer-review.

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 5, 1415, 2009.