

## ***Interactive comment on “Synchronicity of the East Asian Summer Monsoon variability and Northern Hemisphere climate change since the last deglaciation” by T. Shinozaki et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 2 August 2011

General comments: The authors established a high resolution peat cellulose  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  series and compared their curve with those in northeast China and others worldwide. They found a wet-cold/warm-dry climate pattern over the mid-high latitude of East Asia, which is inversely related to that over mid-low latitude. They ascribed such a climate pattern to the intensity and south/north movement of ITCZ and western Pacific subtropical high. In general, the paleo-climatic changes of East Asia and the dynamics behind have been widely concerned and have aroused warm discussions, especially for the most recent years. The location of this study should be an ideal choice to study climatic dynamics of the East Asia, and the high resolution samples with large number of dating measurements are valuable. However, the writing, discussion, and some

fundamental questions make me to suggest a major revision before publication.

Specific comments (1) The variation of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  in atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$  is about 0.5‰ (Fig.3 e), which is too small compared with those in peat cellulose (about 8‰ in this study; Fig.3 d). The variability of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{atm}}$  is also incomparable with that of peat cellulose  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ . Therefore, it is not necessary to calibrate the peat cellulose  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  data with  $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{atm}}$ . In addition, how is the calibration done? From Fig.2, I note the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}'$  (after calibration) is ranged between -24‰~-32‰. does this imply that the original data may vary between -30‰~-40‰. If so, it seems to be quite negative for peat cellulose? Then it is important and necessary to provide the modern plants  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  data around the study site. I note a work of Akagi et al. (Geochemical Journal, Vol. 38, pp. 299 to 306, 2004), in which the peat  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  data seem to be more moderate (about -23‰~-27‰. I therefore suggest the authors to check the experiments (e.g. the cellulose extraction, and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  measurements) and/or calibration method.

(2) The lithology is helpful to constrain the climate pattern, it is better to describe the lithology in detail. Does the profile possibly contain some sections of lacustrine sediments? The authors mentioned two sand layers, this may be useful to understand the climates and to constrain the “peat  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ~climate” response pattern at the study region. Are these two layers correctly marked in the lithology figure? The two layers are about 10cm and 20cm in depth, how to date there? By the way, the TOC data varied within a large range (0~50%; Fig.2 b). This possibly suggests notable changes in lithology. A high resolution TOC measurements or weight loss on ignition may be helpful to catch both the climatic trend and events.

(3) About 6000-9000 is a traditionally generally warm/wet period. However, sedimentation rate during this period is slow (as shown in Fig.2), and the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  during this period is very negative. These two features are very similar with those in the Younger Dryas interval. What does this imply?

(4) The Hani peat  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  curve has been extended to about 14000 aBP (see Hong et

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



al., 3P, 2010 (doi:10.1029/2009JD14297: 214–222), I suggest the authors to compare their Tashiro curve with the whole Hani peat  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  curve. I note although these two curves show high synchronicity for millennial climatic events in the Holocene, they also show general anti-phase trends during about 15000~10000 aBP. Does this imply different climatic dynamics or different “peat  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ~climate” response pattern? Comparisons with more climatic records, especially those of nearby sites, like Lake Biwa, Lake Suigetsu, Maboroshi Cave, would therefore be helpful to constrain the “peat  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ~climate” response pattern and the climatic dynamics.

(5) Continue from (4) : Climatic significance of peat cellulose  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  P 2162, Line 7~15, It is no need to cite so many peat-related but not directly relevant literatures here. Instead, more sentences about the climatic response pattern of grasses should largely improve the reliability of the proxy. How does the modern grass  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  response to climate around the study region?

(6) Paleoclimatic records covering the last deglaciation of East Asia are important to understand the nature of East Asian summer monsoon. However, the present literatures show very complex paleoclimatic changes in Japan, e.g. the debates on YD-like and ACR-like (Antarctic Cold Reversal) patterns of Japanese paleoclimatic records. Different proxy index may respond to different aspect of the climatic changes. Therefore, it is necessary to develop more indices with high resolution and robust dates. From this point of view, the Tashiro mire can provide ideal sediment to extract high resolution and well-dated paleoclimatic information. The present work showed interesting result; however, much more work, both on the development of more proxy indices and on the interpretation of climatic significance, is necessary before deep discussion.

Some minor points (1) P 2184, Caption of table 1: “. . . 121114cm depth”? (2) P 2167, accumulation flux calculation, the units need to be checked. (3) P 2166, line 5, reference Shinozaki et al., 2011, is not appeared in the reference section. (4) P 2163, the geological location coordinates; change  $144^\circ$  to  $140^\circ$ ? (5) P 2187, Figure 2, density to density? (6) I suggest marking the tephra dates in the AMS  $^{14}\text{C}$  dating curve. (7) P

2169, line 5-10, the present sentence is hard to read through, need to be reorganized.  
(8) P 2190, Fig.5, the present caption is quite confused with some English writing error,  
needs to be rewritten.

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 7, 2159, 2011.

CPD

7, C1148–C1151, 2011

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1151

