

# ***Interactive comment on “Spring-summer temperatures reconstructed for northern Switzerland and south-western Germany from winter rye harvest dates, 1454–1970” by O. Wetter and C. Pfister***

**A. Kiss**

kissandi@earth.geo.u-szeged.hu

Received and published: 1 October 2011

## GENERAL COMMENTS

The paper addresses relevant scientific questions within the scope of the journal. It presents novel concepts, ideas, tools and data, and substantial conclusions are reached indeed. The paper is of high scientific value; logically structured, well-organized, with data of unique length, quality and quantity. I like the literature overview, the summary on general climate characteristics. The source types and related back-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



ground, methodology, steps of homogenization, calibration-verification, results are clear and well-defined.

#### SPECIFIC, MINOR COMMENTS:

1. Introduction p. 2611, line 29: correct spelling: KÁŠszeg

3.3 Homogenization of data type p. 2623, lines 9-14: Does this mean that no other, published information (e.g. any published analysis or observations of professional network, agricultural stations/research institute etc.) is available concerning this questions (differences in slope, grain variety etc.), only e-mail communication?

3.5 Calibration – verification p. 2624, line 17: I think it would be useful to replace the 'Wikipedia' entry with some controlled literature reference.

General comment to 3.5 As for calibration period, the authors chose 1774-1824, and 1920-1970 as verification period. I find it as a very good and reasonable idea. However, if such a long overlapping period (with instrumental measurements) is available, it would be interesting to use the opportunity to test with the full period as well, i.e. calibration: 1774-1872; verification: 1873-1970 (also taking Fig 7a-b into consideration).

5. Discussion p. 2628. lines 26-27; p. 2629. line 1: Do you mean 'even though' instead of 'even tough'? The astonishingly good congruities between the presented reconstruction and the Hungarian one might be caused by the fact that in both cases the composites react on July temperatures on the first place, and then June and May (and then on March in case of the Wetter-Pfister reconstruction). Despite the relatively short distance, congruities are relatively weak between the Možnář et al. (2011) cereal-based Czech and the 'mixed' KÁŠszeg (Hungarian) reconstruction, too. For this latter comparison and short reasoning, see: Kiss et al. 2011. It is, I think, due to the fact that the Možnář et al. (2011) temperature reconstruction refers to the month MAMJ and thus, no July is included.

Tables and Figures

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Tables and Figures are informative, complementing well the textual part of the paper.  
Minor comment: I suggest to check through the references concerning publishing dates  
(e.g. MožnĀj et al. 2010 or 2011, Maurer et al. 2009 or 2010, DobrovolnĀj et al. 2010).

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 7, 2609, 2011.

CPD

7, C1541–C1543, 2011

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C1543

