

Interactive comment on “A model comparison study for the Antarctic region: present and past” by M. N. A. Maris et al.

T. van Ommen

tas.van.ommen@aad.gov.au

Received and published: 6 November 2011

In this paper, you use Law Dome accumulation and isotope values from 6k and LGM which you have derived from our 2004 Annals of Glaciology paper (van Ommen, Morgan and Curran [VMC]). I note that your values for temperature at MH and LGM do not match mine.

First, to convert our permille isotope values in d18O to K you need to use our calibration of 0.44 permille/K.

So for MH at Law Dome you report +0.1K whereas VMC fig 7 indicates around +1.1 to 1.4K (0.5-0.6 permille).

For LGM at Law Dome, you report -2.9K whereas VMC fig 7 indicates around -14.8K

C1772

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



(-6.5 permille).

Regarding the large Law Dome LGM temperature change, see Landais et al., QSR 2006 which quotes Morgan et al. Science, 2002. In these papers we cite the LGM deltaT as -15K using the 0.44 permille/K calibration slope, but we note that for the differing glacial conditions that it is possible that a slope more like the spatially derived ~ 0.7 permille/K could be used, yielding a deltaT around -10K. I think this latter argument though is not strong and favour a larger deltaT.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 7, 3583, 2011.

CPD

7, C1772–C1773, 2011

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

