
Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Comparing modelled fire dynamics with charcoal records for the Holocene” by T. Brücher et al.

T. Brücher et al.

tim.bruecher@mpimet.mpg.de

Received and published: 11 February 2014

Dear Referee,

thanks for your critical and helpful comments on the paper to improve it further.

Please find our specific changes to your comments in the attached (pdf) document!

With best regards, Tim Bruecher

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 9, 6429, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive comment on “Comparing modelled fire dynamics with charcoal records for the Holocene”
by T. Brücher et al.

Reply to Anonymous Referee #3

Dear Referee,

thanks for your critical and helpful comments on the paper to improve it further.

Please find our specific changes to your comments:

General comments:

1. *This manuscript stands to benefit from a thorough language edit. However, these issues could easily be resolved.*

The revised manuscript will include language edits (see also response to reviewer #2).

2. *I agree with Reviewer #2 that the recently published paper by Molinari and coauthors (2013) should be drawn into the manuscript. Further, a recently published fire data-model paper by Feurdean and co-authors (2013) should also be compared against the results presented here.*

Feurdean, A., Liakka, J., Vannière, B., Marinova, E., Hutchinson, S. M., Mosburgger, V., & Hickler, T. (2013). 12,000-Years of fire regime drivers in the lowlands of Transylvania (Central-Eastern Europe): a data-model approach. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 81, 48-61.

Thanks for pointing us to that paper. In the revised manuscript we include it in the introduction to inform about local studies dealing with data-model comparison. We did, however, not include a comparison of our results against the one published in Feurdean et al. (2013). Our study compares large area means of fire activity over the Holocene. Feurdean et al. focuses on a small area, which is out of the scope of our study.

3. Aside from a few minor grammatical issues, I appreciate that the authors state their research questions in the Introductory of the manuscript. I encourage the authors to revisit (and answer) their questions in the Conclusions as well.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

