

Interactive comment on “Sedimentary archives of climate and sea-level changes during the Holocene in the Rhone prodelta (NW Mediterranean Sea)” by Anne-Sophie Fanget et al.

L. Giosan (Referee)

lgiosan@whoi.edu

Received and published: 1 August 2016

This is an excellent paper all around that shows the potential of distal delta deposits for paleoenvironmental reconstructions. Here are some weaker points that need to be addressed:

1. the paper needs a better justification for radiocarbon data rejection.
2. inversions in radiocarbon ages are indicative of reworking, which is a well known fact of life in these environments regardless of the facies discussed in the paper. Note that I am not talking about reworking of very old microfossils that show on their morphology or color that they are old and reworked; I am talking of specimens that could be 1000-

C1

2000 years older and look like new. But 1000 years is a long time in the Holocene. In these conditions the paper needs a discussion on reworking and transport of microfossils used in this study. Do they matter and how much? Can reworked shallow species mimic a hydrological event? This request might seem hard but it is important if prodeltaic records are to be used for paleohydrology. And the authors have the right data to make a good case that reworking is secondary.

I am looking forward to read the revised discussion including these points.

Liviu Giosan Geoscientist Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., doi:10.5194/cp-2016-57, 2016.

C2