

## ***Interactive comment on “Last-glacial to postglacial climate formation in the continental interior inferred from multi-proxy records of Lake Hovsgol, Mongolia” by K. Minoura et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 31 May 2010

The paper of Minoura et al. deals with the environmental and climate history in Lake Hovsgol area (Mongolia) since the last glacial. Generally the topic of the paper is of interest for the readership of CP, and also the original data are possibly of interest, however, the presentation and discussion of the results contains major problems. The manuscript is therefore not acceptable for CP. 1. The scope of the paper remains unclear after reading the introduction. 2. The paper is organized in an absolutely unconventional way and was therefore difficult to review e.g. Methods and Results were mixed up in one section. 3. Abstract: It remains absolutely unclear after reading the abstract what has been done in this study and what were the results and implications of the study. 4. Introduction: Don't start with a site description! General information

C264

on the focus and scope of the study are necessary here, furthermore the specific research questions or objectives were not clearly stated. Earlier palaeoclimatological and palaeoecological works should be reviewed. 5. Site description: The description of the locations is scattered in the first and second section. This section needs to be re-organized. 6. Material: Provide more details on sediment collection. What corer, from which depth originate the cores. Don't compare your material here with Lake Baikal. This should be part of the discussion section. 7. Methods: Hitherto, no separate Methods chapter exists. Mixing the methods with the results is absolutely unacceptable. 8. Results: Please provide all your results in the figures and present them in more detail. Pollen: Provide a full pollen diagram not just pollen concentrations of some taxa. Pollen concentrations are of no use. Eighter present the data in pollen influx or in pollen percentages maybe best both. Provide a detailed discussion of the relative changes of the different pollen taxa in the single zones. Indicate pollen assemblage zone maybe assisted by depth-constrained cluster analyses. grain size: Provide all data not just clay content. How the zones were extracted from the data? diatom data. No diatom data are shown! The description in the text is thus of no use. 9. Discussion: As the scope of the paper is unclear also the discussion is unstructured. Furthermore, the study does not consider the relevant literature from the area. I would suggest: First discuss the proxy values of each of your parameter. Second, reconstruct the environmental changes based on your records. Third, concluded on the wider palaeoecological and palaeoclimatic implications of your record.

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 6, 385, 2010.

C265