

Interactive comment on “Late Holocene summer temperatures in the central Andes reconstructed from the sediments of high-elevation Laguna Chepical, Chile (32° S)” by R. de Jong et al.

M. nbsp;L. Carrevedo

marialaura.carrevedo@gmail.com

Received and published: 29 June 2013

Referee Comment Dear Editor of Climate of the Past Natascha Töpfer Journal: CP Title: Late Holocene summer temperatures in the central Andes reconstructed from the sediments of high-elevation Laguna Chepical, Chile (32°S) Author(s): R. de Jong et al. MS No.: cp-2013-48 MS Type: Research Article This paper provides new and valuable Paleoenvironmental data for Laguna Chepical and therefore has the potential for making a good contribution to the knowledge of the temperature reconstructions for the Late Holocene of South America. However the age model does not provide good curve (see the graphic attached). It would be better to reproduce de age model with new better

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



dates. This manuscript has been very well written. Besides there are technical/typing errors: Page 2281 Line17: is not Fig. 1c Line25: the cite (www.mineria.gov.ar) is not in the references Page 2283 Line18: Traschel et al, 2008 is not in the references Page 2284 Line10: Appleby, 2001 is not in the references Line24:word model is repeated Page 2285 Line19: incomplete cite: and Conslink Page 2303 Fig.1 c) Is lake bathymetry Page 2305 Fig.3 Correct: visible range are

Manuscript Evaluation Criteria Principal Criteria Excellent (1) Good (2) Fair (3) Poor (4) Scientific Significance: Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of Climate of the Past (substantial new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)? 1 Scientific Quality: Are the scientific approach and applied methods valid? Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way (consideration of related work, including appropriate references)? 1 Presentation Quality: Are the scientific results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well-structured way (number and quality of figures/tables, appropriate use of English language)? 1

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.clim-past-discuss.net/9/C1302/2013/cpd-9-C1302-2013-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 9, 2277, 2013.

CPD

9, C1302–C1303, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

