

Interactive comment on “A few prospective ideas on climate reconstruction: from a statistical single proxy approach towards a multi-proxy and dynamical approach” by J. Guiot et al.

M. Crucifix (Editor)

michel.crucifix@uclouvain.be

Received and published: 10 July 2009

The article posted by Guiot et al. underwent extensive comments of three reviewers. The most serious criticisms were

1. The paper essentially reviews the contribution of the group led by the first author in vegetation and climate reconstruction without offering new technical developments;
2. The paper as it stands would not satisfy a statistician audience, lacking the necessary details to be properly assessed.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



3. English is poor and at places confusing
4. The authors may have missed the opportunity to bring forward a number of other substantial issues in state-of-the art vegetation reconstruction.

The were other comments.

Issue one is the most vital given the editorial line of climate-of-the-past. One of the reviewers correctly writes “this is a matter for the editors” if such an article may nevertheless be considered for publication. My answer would be yes, in this case, for two reasons. First, reviewers have been unanimous in recognising that the work led by Guiot is ambitious and vital for modern palaeoclimatology. Second, special circumstances apply here given that this paper is written for a special issue, tribute to Andre Berger: The article is meant to give an accessible overview of a very difficult and technical discipline to which Andre has undeniably given an important impulse.

Admittedly, the authors have invested a significant effort in the revision of this paper and they undeniably improved its pedagogical character of the article and they have also clarified its goals. Nevertheless, it is still premature to authorise publication, for the following reasons:

1. English is still poor at places. I certainly encourage the authors to seek for additional editorial assistance.
2. Transparency of model assumptions is a key to Bayesian statistics, as outlined by the reviewers. The authors admit this, for example by suggesting to publish some R code in the literature. The urge for transparency should certainly better appear in the manuscript.
3. My reading of the manuscript suggests me that the comments of reviewer 3 have been dealt with a bit too superficially.

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

My decision is as follows: I am returning an annotated manuscript, with editorial requests including: grammar improvements, requests for clarifications and requests of a more general nature like shortening the conclusion. After the revision, the manuscript will be returned to reviewer 3 for further advice. Of course, reviewers 1 and 4 remain welcomed to post any additional comment.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 5, 99, 2009.

CPD

5, S305–S307, 2009

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

