Clim. Past Discuss., 8, C1780–C1781, 2012
www.clim-past-discuss.net/8/C1780/2012/
© Author(s) 2012. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.

Climate of the Past Discussions

Interactive comment on "Climate field reconstruction of East Asian spring temperature" *by* M. Ohyama et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 October 2012

General comments: The paper has a potential to be published in Climate of the Past, but it has to be significantly revised. I think as particularly important following comments: a) The authors selected five chronologies to reconstruct spring temperature by using PC regression, from the contribution percentage, accumulation contribution is 54%, which is little bit lower. The explained variance in Table 2 and on page 3538, line 27, "the explained total variance is 19.4% " are both not very high, which directly caused a big difference between estimation and actual temperature in Fig 3 a . So could you try other reconstruction approaches? b) Page 3539, What does it mean "PC1 (29.0% of the variance) represents the Korean chronologies, while PC2 (25.3% of the variance) represents the Japanese chronologies", how did you make a judgment? c) Page 3537, please give more detailed meteorological data information. Why you choose two datasets of CRUTEM3 and HadCRUT3? From your data source, only

Full Screen / Esc
Printer-friendly Version
Interactive Discussion
Discussion Paper

tree-ring records were selected, no marine sediments or corals were used, and I suggested that land air temperature reconstruction is enough in this manuscript. d) Page 3545, you mentioned the reference of Zhu et al, 2009, the reconstruction of Zhu et al is Feb.-Apr. temperature, same as your spring time, but from your comparison with other reconstructions part, I did not see that this reconstruction was shown in the Fig 3. I compared them personally, and found many differences between of them, so could you give some reasons for the differences?

Specific comments: a) On the title, since this reconstruction only covered small region, which did not match with “East Asian”, a large area, please change with another name. b) Caption of Figure 1 is not clear, some information has been included in the text, but here it is also important to show full information to the readers. c) More data analyses need to be done in the results, e.g. interannual - interdecadal variability. d) Page 3542, line 3-8, do you think the low temperature caused by volcanic eruptions did not impact the tree growth? Or the precipitation was enough, which was hidden behind the influence of low temperature.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 8, 3535, 2012.