

Interactive comment on “Correlation of Greenland ice-core isotope profiles and the terrestrial record of the Alpine Rhine glacier for the period 32–15 ka” by M. G. G. De Jong et al.

M.-F. Loutre (Editor)

marie-france.loutre@uclouvain.be

Received and published: 8 March 2012

Dear authors,

First, I would like to underline the quality of the discussion between the reviewers and you. The manuscript was clearly presented and well written. Major issues were discussed during the discussion phase.

The reviewers raised major concerns regarding the paper. I will not list them all here. They are available in the reviewers' comments. Still I will underline a few of them.

- the chronology of the Rhine glacier and the uncertainty on it is not fully compatible

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

with a precise correlation with Greenland

- the general purpose of the paper. Both AR1 and AR2 missed the relation with climate, the forcing processes, or physical interpretation while obviously your purpose, as you wrote several times in your response, is only stratigraphy.

- the mathematical method seems to go beyond its field of application.

- AR1 suggests strengthening the discussion part.

- The response time is not accounted for and may be different in the ice core record and in the Rhine glacier record.

I acknowledge that you gave detailed and clearly presented answers to the reviewers. You strongly insisted on the potentially significant contribution of stratigraphy in this context. You underlined the strength of your mathematical method to detect otherwise unnoticed features. Nevertheless, Reviewer #2 was still not yet convinced.

When reading all the comments, it appears clearly that this paper deserves more than a major revision to take them into account and to include your answers in the paper. Moreover, all the discussion did not convince me, as an editor, that the manuscript, as it stands now, represents a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of the journal.

Therefore, I am sorry to reject this paper for publication in CP. Of course, you still have the possibility to re-submit your revised manuscript to the journal. It will then be considered as a new manuscript.

Sincerely yours, Marie-France

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 7, 4335, 2011.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)