

Interactive comment on “Reconstruction of the March–August PDSI since 1703 AD based on tree rings of Chinese pine (*Pinus tabulaeformis* Carr.) in the Lingkong Mountain, southeast Chinese loess Plateau” by Q. Cai et al.

J. Guiot (Editor)

guiot@cerege.fr

Received and published: 9 January 2014

Dear authors

You can see that the comments from three reviewers are all positive and that your paper can be accepted after minor revision. They raise several points that you can see in their review text. Among them, I insist particularly on these ones:

- The introduction should end with the scientific question you want to answer in the paper: you present the methodology that you want to develop but nothing is told about

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



the climatic aspects of your results.

- In the same idea, when you compare IAPO and PDSI, you should go in deeper explanation about the underlined mechanisms

- Your dendrochronological methodology (used to construct the final chronology) is not explained in enough details for a more general public (CP is not a disciplinary journal for dendrochronologists)

- A question raised by two reviewers is why there is a so important reduction in the number of cores finally used ? Is there is confusion between cores and trees? Are they representative of the complete set?

- More explanation is needed to make better understandable the behaviour of PDSI, as well in relation with temperature, precipitation than on the fact that this variable is highly persistent (see the comments of rev#2 and rev#3)

- I do not think that there is so precise peaks in your spectrum. First they are not extremely significant, second you have not a sufficient resolution to distinguish between 2.5 and 2.7, between 3 and 3.2, 7.6 and 7.8, third it is clear that the 102 yr cycle is not reliable because of the low number of years. Then be more cautious in interpreting it.

- You should merge table 1 and table 2; in the caption of the tables, you need to be more explicit (what is r, R2, F etc...)

Please submit a revised version with a cover letter where you explain the change you have done in the revised version. Provide also a reply to the comments of the three reviewers.

Best regards

Joel Guiot

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 9, 6311, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

