

Interactive comment on “Sources and transport of dust to East Antarctica: new insights from high-resolution terrestrial and marine aerosol records from the Talos Dome ice core” by S. Schüpbach et al.

E. Isaksson (Editor)

elisabeth.isaksson@npolar.no

Received and published: 3 September 2013

The data presented in the paper is very interesting but deserves a better presentation- also emphasized by ref 2. Please consider in particular the division of chapters and sections for the “Results and Discussion” part. I am afraid that the main message gets lots in the way it is presented now.

p. 5 line 9. This is high resolution proxy- aerosol data. This should be used throughout the paper. p. 8 line 4-8. Regarding flux calculations. Can you say something more

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



about how the accumulation was modeled and in what time resolution? Since you are using flux this is very important for the reader to know. Fig. 2. It would be easier for the reader to read the figure if the different panels/curves had labels on them, in the figure. Again, I don't think you should label the Ca^{2+} and Na^{+} as "aerosol records".

Fig. 4. I don't think it is so evident that the fluxes are anti-correlated from the figure. The data series are not continuous and trends the easily confuses the eye. Can it be plotted differently? What about error bars- is that possible to include? You mention 30% uncertainties in chapter 2.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 9, 3321, 2013.

CPD

9, C1917–C1918, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

