

Interactive comment on “Vegetation responses to interglacial warming in the Arctic, examples from Lake El’gygytgyn, northeast Siberia” by A. V. Lozhkin and P. M. Anderson

A. V. Lozhkin and P. M. Anderson

pata@u.washington.edu

Received and published: 10 March 2013

“Vegetation responses to interglacial warming in the Arctic, examples from Lake El’gygytgyn, northeast Siberia”

Response to Referee #1

We appreciate your comments on our manuscript which reflect the careful attention paid to specific details and broader discussion issues. We have corrected the specific points that you noted and also clarified in the abstract the reasoning for the choice of interglaciations. Part of that choice is the result of a Lake E workshop where participants decided that additional pollen counts would be useful to flesh out the “super”

C111

interglaciations.

The suggestion to reorient the discussion on glacial vs. interglacial vegetation feedback was spot-on. However, after thinking more about this point, we decided to limit discussions about feedback to the end of section 5, where we believe it fits more logically. We also decided to keep the discussion of feedbacks rather brief as we intend to write additional papers on the Lake E interglaciations as more pollen counts are completed. We believe that at this point a more detailed consideration would be warranted. This strategy also holds true for your points about climate vs delayed migration, points that brought up important considerations.

We added a short discussion emphasizing the point you made about the role of moisture for influencing interglacial vegetation. We felt that much was said in the previous section, as you mentioned, and that additional discussion beyond what we added was probably not needed.

We had not given any thought to Quaternary extinctions – something we agree that would be fun and interesting to explore as additional data come in.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 9, 245, 2013.