

Interactive comment on “Late Glacial and Holocene changes in vegetation cover and climate in southern Siberia derived from a 15 kyr long pollen record from Lake Kotokel” by P. E. Tarasov et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 28 January 2009

The manuscript written by P.E. Tarasov et al reports an investigation of the Late Glacial and Holocene vegetation and climate history in the southern part of Central Siberia. Reliable quantitative climate reconstructions from the area are still rare despite of rather numerous paleoenvironmental studies in and around Baikal Lake. Therefore the new high-resolution palynological studies of unique long-term lacustrine sediment record and, especially, new quantitative climate reconstruction are very valuable contribution to our knowledge of the environmental changes in the past. Generally, the manuscript perfectly fits to mean CP criteria as it: 1) addresses relevant scientific questions within

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the scope of journal, 2) presents novel data, 3) reaches substantial conclusions, 4) methods and assumptions are clearly outlined, 5) presented results are sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions, 6) description of calculations sufficiently complete and precise, 7) authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own contribution, 8) title clearly reflect the contents of the paper, 9) abstract provide a concise and complete summary, 10) overall presentation well structured and clear, 11) the language fluent and precise, although some minor corrections are still needed. 12) used symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used. 13) generally the paper text and figures are well present the data, interpretations and conclusions. However, the figure 2 presenting pollen data which are basis for the further paleoclimatic and paleoenvironmental reconstructions is too small and should be shown in a bigger scale in order to give a better chance for evaluation of the primarily data. More comments for the figure see below. 14) generally, the number and quality of references are appropriate, but in few cases need some improvement

Some minor remarks, which can help to improve the manuscript, are below. The printed version with some linguistic suggestions of minor importance will be also send to the corresponding author directly.

1. page 130 line 5 (1 kyr= 1000 cal. yr) you already mentioned it in Abstract.
2. page 132 The information concerning pollen concentration is completely missed except the remark that pollen content was lower in the 3 bottom samples. Did you count pollen concentration in the studied samples at all? Such information can help a lot for the realistic vegetation reconstruction.
3. pages 134-135 Normally, the numbering of pollen zones started from the bottom (e.g. PZ 1) to the upper part of the records (e.g. PZ X). It seems to be more logical to start the numbering from the bottom in the Kotokel record as well.
4. page 140 line 9 YD interstadial. Seems to be mistyping. Should be stadial.

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

5. page 142 line 14 If this publication is in a Russian journal title should be in Russian but not translated.

6. lines 29-30 The publication title should be translated from Russian as you did it for other references.

7. page 143 lines 22-24 If this publication is in a Russian book, the book title should be in Russian but not translated. Therefore, a correct title of the book is Golotsen.

8. page 145 line 20 Here you use the lake name in form Kotokel’ Lake. Although, Kotokel’ fits better to the spoken name form I think that you should use the lake name as Lake Kotokel as you did it in the paper.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 5, 127, 2009.

CPD

5, S13–S15, 2009

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

