Clim. Past Discuss., 9, C1099–C1100, 2013
www.clim-past-discuss.net/9/C1099/2013/

Climate of the Past Discussions

Interactive comment on "Re-evaluation of the age model for North Atlantic Ocean Site 982 – arguments for a return to the original chronology" *by* K. T. Lawrence et al.

L. Lanci (Referee)

luca.lanci@uniurb.it

Received and published: 14 June 2013

After reading this manuscript and the relavant references, I am convinced that the original age model for North-Atlantic ODP Site 982, defended in this paper is a better model than that proposed by Khelifi et al. (2012). In my opinion, therefore, this paper should be published since it documents the proper age model of ODP Site 982.

Lawrence et al. re-evaluation comprehensively consider different aspects of the age model including the variability of sedimentation rates and comparison of climate proxies records between this and other sites. Although these are not definitive evidences, one would certainly choose the Lawrence et al. model based on the "Occam rasor"

criterion.

In my opinion, however, the strongest evidence favoring the Lawrence et al. age model is provided by the revised position of the Brunhes/Matuyama boundary by Channell and Guyodo (2004). In fact, the major point of the Khelifi et al. (2012) age model was to reconcile the position of the Brunhes/Matuyama reversal in hole A and B, with the oxygen isotope record, which is not supported by the new magnetostratigraphy. For this reason, I think it would be a good idea to report this crucial piece of information (i.e., shipboard and revised B/M positions) in one of the existing figure.

When talking about regional data comparison (section 3), I would strongly suggest to provide a quantitative estimate of how much the correlation of paleoclimate time series with Site U1313 is improved using the age model of Lawrence et al. compared to Khelifi et al. (2012). This would would be important to eliminate the subjective point of view in evaluating the correlation.

Last but not least, I find the use of colors in figures 2-6 rather confusing; probably they would be totally unreadable for color-blind people. I would suggest to differentiate lines using (also) line thickness, dashing etc.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 9, 2217, 2013.