

Interactive comment on “An underestimated record breaking event: why summer 1540 was very likely warmer than 2003” by O. Wetter and C. Pfister

P. Yiou

pascal.yiou@lsce.ipsl.fr

Received and published: 7 September 2012

M. O. Wetter took the time to respond to my comments. Although there is no much point in arguing at this point (because my comments were not a review), one issue still has to be straightened out: Wetter write:

"REPLY: That the critique of Keenan was rejected by the editor of "Nature" is irrelevant. What matters, however, is the validity of his key argument that reads as follows: "The model-estimated temperature for 2003 is 5.86°C (8.10 standard deviations) greater than the 1960–1989 mean temperature. For 2003, the observed temperature was only 3.50 °C (4.84 standard deviations) above the 1960–1989 mean temperature. That

C1474

is, the model overestimated the temperature for 2003 by 2.36°C (3.26 standard deviations)". The observational temperatures were provided by Meteo-France. (Keenan 2007, p. 255). From para 3 it is concluded that August temperatures did in no way matter for the extremely early grape harvest in 2003."

Thank you for instructing me what is relevant or not. Keenan's critique was rejected after a peer review (not by me nor any co-author of Chuine et al.). In our unpublished comment (by TAC), we demonstrated that the numbers cited by Keenan were off (in particular because he did not use homogenised temperature data sets, as we did). There were other issues (especially on the use of statistics) that I could explain if I am invited to publish them. Thus, I insist that continuing to blindly cite Keenan without checking is not very ethical (nor relevant) in a scientific journal such as CP.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 8, 2695, 2012.