

Interactive comment on “Palaeostages of the Caspian Sea as a set of regional benchmark tests for the evaluation of climate model simulations” by A. Kislov et al.

K. Arpe (Referee)

klaus.arpe@zmaw.de

Received and published: 25 February 2013

I have the feeling that the discussion gets out of proportion. I made several suggestions and comments with the aim to help to improve the manuscript and do not expect that everything is taken up by the authors. I agree that the decadal variability of the CSL can mostly be explained by the VRD, I have done it myself too. I dispute however that this is enough justification for extending it for inter millennium variability. Already for the last century I have shown in my last response that one needs most likely the evaporation over the CS to explain 1 of 3 m variability of the CSL. Without a complicated model we know that the evaporation over the CS must have been much lower during the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



LGM than now and our model results have shown a reduction by a third but as P-E over the Volga Basin was even stronger reduced, it resulted in a lowering of the CSL in accordance with the observational evidence presented here. From the vigour response by the authors not to show the evaporation values of the CS, one can deduct that this value does not fit to the observations. If so, it is not right to suppress this information but one has to investigate why it is so.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 8, 5053, 2012.

CPD

8, C3450–C3451, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3451

