

Interactive comment on “Late Pliocene age control and composite depths at ODP Site 982, revisited” by N. Khélifi et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 6 June 2011

The paper needs some work before it is suitable for publication:

(1) In the figures, are the Hole B isotope data from Venz and Hodell (2002)? It seems to be, in which case the reference should be in figure captions, and this should be stated in Section 4 of the text. (2) Channell and Guyodo (2004) provided an update of the shipboard magnetic data using u-channel samples. Unlike the shipboard data, the u-channel data involve the calculation of magnetization components, whereas the shipboard data are based on single demagnetization steps. The M/G boundary lies in 982A-6H-4 at 77 cm in the u-channel data at 57.28 mcd. (3) I advise not making a statement about the Mammoth Subchron in the Conclusions (section 7). ³Here, it is possible to identify the Mammoth magnetic eventŠ..². Channell and Lehman (1999) did not identify this subchron (not ³event²) because of the very weak magnetization

Interactive
Comment

intensities and insufficient (shipboard) demagnetization treatment. (4) English usage needs some work in this paper. For example: ³better comparable to \check{S}^2 should be ³more consistent with \check{S}^2 (line 14, abstract), and ³for establishing² should be ³in² (line 20). (5) ³In harmony with Channell and Lehman (1999) we lump these excursions with the Matuyama Chron² (section 3, line 16). This implies that Channell and Lehman believed these to be excursions (which they did (do) not!). (6) Is it convention to write Holes (H capitalized) when referring to Holes A, B C etc.?

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 7, 1631, 2011.

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