



Duration of MIS 11. This is a complex question, which, for instance, is currently debated in a PAGES group devoted to the Past Interglacials. Apart from the chronological uncertainties mentioned above, the major difficulty is likely to assess when an interglacial period starts and ends. In the case of the multiproxy approach used at lake El'gygytgyn, the problem is maybe even worse depending of the proxy we consider. Nevertheless I agree that at El'gygytgyn, like in some (a few?) other globally distributed sites, MIS 11 has a long duration compared to the following (younger) interglacials. Is the duration 27 or 25 or 30, that's another problem and I don't think we can be more precise at this stage of the knowledge and taking into account the different uncertainties.

Following the reviewer #1, I will recommend to reduce the speculative interpretations either because of the significance of the proxies (but again it's not my expertise) or because of the uncertainties linked with the age models. At least evaluation of uncertainties should be provided.

In summary, the submitted paper by Vogel et al. provides a unique high-resolution set of multiproxy data with information related to environmental changes of a remote continental place of the Arctic, and we should be grateful to the authors for that. Because of the lack of such data covering the MIS 11 interglacial it is essential to have such data published and available for the paleo-community. Should the paper to be published, it should, before to be accepted, highlight the new results and interpretations since the Science paper of Melles et al.(2012), assess more thoroughly the uncertainties of the different chronologies that make the correlations between different events observed in other globally distributed climatic records speculative, and reduce a branch of speculative interpretations.

A very few and certainly not exhaustive specific line-by-line remarks, which should be completed on a future revised version.

P. 6311, line 23: we should avoid touse the word "analogue", but you can speak of "orbital analogue". P. 6311, lines 25-27. Are you really convinced about what is said by

C3361

this sentence? At least replace "will" by "could"

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 8, 6309, 2012.

C3362