

***Interactive comment on “Comment on “Sea level  
~400 000 years ago (MIS 11): analogue for present  
and future sea-level?” by D. Q. Bowen (2010)  
Can the extrapolation of uplift rates from MIS 5e  
shorelines to MIS 11 replace direct and tangible  
evidence of the latter’s sea-level history?” by  
P. J. Hearty***

**EW Wolff (Editor)**

ewwo@bas.ac.uk

Received and published: 5 May 2010

The paper now has two peer reviews by experts on palaeo sea levels, as well as a discussion response from Bowen. The independent reviewers both value the idea of a debate about what is undoubtedly a controversial issue, and both highlight some points from your paper that they feel were well worth making. However they both feel that the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



valuable points are somewhat lost in a rhetorical comment that emphasises both more and less substantial and substantive objections.

You are of course still encouraged to submit to the discussion a measured response to each of the review comments. However, in view of the reviews and my own reading of the situation, I do not encourage a re-drafting of the paper for final publication in CP. There are two reasons for this:

Firstly, I think that the level of re-writing required to make a proper scientific paper suitable for the final journal is so great that it would effectively be a different paper. Such a paper would have to concentrate only on a few issues (as proposed in the three points highlighted by reviewer 1). It would need to have a quite different style. Furthermore, mostly it would be a re-iteration of points you have already made elsewhere.

Secondly, I think the main purpose you required has been achieved by the CPD publication of your paper. In the normal process I would have hoped that your criticisms of Bowen's paper would have appeared as discussion comments on his original CPD paper, and there would have then been no need for further comment. Because this stage was missed, it has no doubt been valuable to have the criticisms aired in a separate paper in CPD. Your comments (and Bowen's response) are now linked to both the CPD and CP versions of Bowen's paper, and therefore any online readers (and effectively all our readers are online readers) will be made aware of them.

In summary, your paper in CPD and the response and reviews will allow readers (both of your and Bowen's paper) to see that there is a controversy, and to see the arguments laid out. I see no additional value in you preparing a final CP version: to be suitable for CP, the paper would require a lot of work and a different approach, and I do not encourage submission of such a new version.

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 6, 295, 2010.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

