

## ***Interactive comment on “Pre-LGM Northern Hemisphere paleo-ice sheet topography” by J. Kleman et al.***

**C. R. Stokes (Referee)**

c.r.stokes@durham.ac.uk

Received and published: 6 June 2013

This paper reconstructs the pre-LGM topography of the Northern Hemisphere ice sheets with a particular emphasis on marine isotope stages 5b and 4, and comparison to stage 2. The strength of the manuscript lies in its approach, which uses glacial geological evidence of putative past ice sheet extents to tune a numerical ice sheet model, which then provides reconstructions of the 3-D geometry of the ice sheets. These reconstructions (e.g. of ice sheet thickness) represent important boundary conditions for atmospheric modelling prior to the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM), which partly motivates this study. In contrast, previous work has tended to only present and discuss geological evidence, or only use numerical modelling that is poorly constrained by geological evidence. A further strength lies in the scope of the manuscript in that it deals

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



with both the North American and Eurasian Ice Sheets, when most other studies are restricted to either North America or Eurasia and sometimes just one ice sheet. The manuscript is also very well written, well-organised, and uses Figures appropriately. Studies of pre-LGM ice sheets are often necessarily speculative and often rather long treatises, and so I expect this concise and accessible manuscript to be a useful and valuable contribution to the relatively small number of studies on pre-LGM ice sheets.

That said, there are a small number of relatively minor points that I would recommend are addressed/clarified in a revised manuscript.

1. The Introduction is excellent and provides a very useful context, but it is rather long. I wonder if the authors might consider splitting it into a brief Introduction, followed by a 'Previous Work' section? In relation to this, I think it would be helpful to warn the reader that the current Section 2 is actually moving on to the Methods for reconstructing the spatial extent of the ice sheets and thus might be better entitled "2. Methods", followed by "2.1. Spatial extent of ice sheets based on geological evidence", since it should also be made clear that these 2D extents are all based on glacial geology.

2. Page 2561, line 12: It's perhaps a nuanced point, but the Stokes et al modelling was constrained by geological data for the final deglaciation, i.e. the model was run from the last interglaciation (122 ka) and those model runs that failed to fit the final deglacial record (e.g. dated ice margin chronology) were eliminated in the ensemble analysis. This should help increase the plausibility of the pre-LGM model runs, but perhaps not to the same degree as the analysis in the present paper.

3. Page 2563, lines 11-14: this is one of the few places where I think the reader may benefit from some additional information/clarification. The authors point out that they "weighed the evidence and decided on what we consider the most likely alternative...". I acknowledge that there is large uncertainty, but can the authors reassure the reader that these decisions were taken as objectively as possible. Were any criteria employed and/or what type of evidence was weighed and judged? Maybe even a short example

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

might help of how disparate sources of evidence were reconciled or ignored. I wouldn't want to see an important study accused of being too speculative/subjective.

4. Section 2.1 "North America". In this review, I was a little surprised to see some important studies not cited. I realise that the Introduction is clear in stating that this section is based primarily on the recent review by Kleman et al. (2010) "and references therein", but I think a little bit of discussion (and at the least a citation) is required for some of the key studies, e.g. Clark et al. (1993), Boulton and Clark (1990), the clutch of papers in GPQ vol. 41 (2) in 1987, and Clark and Lea (1992) Special Paper.

5. Page 2574, lines 16-18: I was intrigued by this sentence and citation, which would appear to be quite relevant to the Discussion in this paper. I wonder whether the authors might consider adding a few more sentences of explanation, e.g. quite how radically different are these ice sheet configurations; what were they based on; and what might have caused them?

6. Page 2575, lines 9-11: I can certainly appreciate the authors' reluctance not to reiterate the long-standing debate over mono- versus –multi-domed ice sheets, but it is important to perhaps briefly inform the uninitiated of which configuration current finds most favour and why.

7. Page 2575, lines 17-21: Compared to the rest of the paper, this paragraph is poorly written (with several typos) and seems to be too brief (almost as an afterthought?). However, I think it is making a really important point, given that LGM portioning of global ice volumes is very poorly understood. Thus, I would strongly encourage the authors to expand this paragraph and perhaps incorporate some literature that also estimates Southern Hemisphere contributions, perhaps based on evidence from the southern-hemisphere and/or numerical modelling.

8. Figure 6: I can see the advantage of placing each panel in chronological order from top to bottom, but this Figure is quite small on a printed page. Of course, most people will read the paper online and zoom in, but I'd encourage the authors to consider

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



enlarging these important panels.

Minor technical points:

2558, lines 1 and 23: delete “here” (it seems unnecessary)

2558, lines 15-19: this sentence is awkward. Suggest re-write.

2559, line 29 and on to following page: this sentence is awkward. Suggest re-write.

2560, line 9: “ice sheet”

2560, line 11: this sentence could do with some supporting citations (e.g. Boulton and Clark, 1990; Hubbard et al., etc?)

2560, line 12: I think I know what you mean, but it might be useful to state what you mean by “core areas”

2560, line 15: delete “available”

2560, line 16: delete the first “the”

2560, line 26: this sentence needs re-writing.

2561, lines 7-10: “are also unable to generate a southward extent of the Quebec dome, during ice sheet build-up, that is sufficiently...”

2562, line 23: “...location is important.”

2563, lines 4-7: do the authors need to make it clear that these “spatial reconstructions” are all based on glacial geological evidence? Are they?

2566, lines 1-2: “Eurasian ice sheet, that a British Ice Sheet may have provided, was potentially...”

2569, line 6: delete “here”

2569, lines 21-22: “...was that they achieved a good fit, in ice sheet outline and location,

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



to the available...”

2574, line 24: “were largely...”

2575, line 7: delete “in the model”

2575, line 11: “underestimates”

2575, line 24: is “additional” required?

2576, lines 4-7: I think it is important to point out here that the MIS 5d ice sheet was actually the first to emerge. Otherwise, it reads as if 5b was the first period of ice sheet growth.

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 9, 2557, 2013.

## CPD

9, C1044–C1048, 2013

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

