

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

E. Zorita (Editor)

eduardo.zorita@hzg.de

Received and published: 10 November 2012

Both referees identify added value in the manuscript but also make a series of suggestions that the authors should heed to improve the manuscript. In their response, the authors essentially agree with most suggestions, and therefore, the submission of a revised version is encouraged.

In the exchange between reviewers and authors a few points have been raised that, in my view, are important enough to be included in the revised abstract, and which were absent in the initial submission. I would suggest to include in the revised abstract that:

- the reconstruction is considered skilful for interannual time-scales but not for long-term change (the original abstract needs to be corrected on this point)

C2320

- two Japan chronologies do not show coherence with the other chronologies . This can be helpful for subsequent studies on this region

-the reconstruction does not show a clear temperature response after the Laki and Tambora eruptions

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

C2321