Clim. Past Discuss., doi:10.5194/cp-2016-65-EC2, 2016 © Author(s) 2016. CC-BY 3.0 License.



CPD

Interactive comment

Interactive comment on "The climate of the Mediterranean basin during the Holocene from terrestrial and marine pollen records: A model/data comparison" *by* Odile Peyron et al.

J. Guiot (Editor)

guiot@cerege.fr

Received and published: 21 November 2016

Dear authors Thank you for your long reply. But it is very difficult to follow. The comments of the authors are mixed with your replies and I had to compare your letter to the original reviews to separate comments and replies. It is very annoying. Moreover your letter is not structured and refers to unexisting numbers in the reviews. So, you start with a reply to rev#2 then you go to rev#1 and go back to rev#2. Point 15 of rev#2 does not exist. Finally (BUT VERY IMPORTANT), as I mentioned in my previous message, I NEED a "track change mode" revised version of the ms linked to your reply. This will greatly accelerate the review process.

By the way, I am not convinced by some of your replies. For example:

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



When rev#1 asks you to identify new conclusions according to previous studies, he means according to results on the climate changes and not only according to the fact that you use two periods and a RCM. By the way, Roberts et al (2011) compared model simulations and data on four periods separated by 2000 years.

Your reply to rev#2 concerning the use of precipitation instead of moisture index is not satisfying. The fact that the data used by Bartlein are "old" data is not an argument. The argument that alpha is not available from RCM is also not correct (particularly for a RCM). Mediterranean vegetation is not limited by precipitation but by soil water. I agree that monsoon is a matter of precipitation, but when you compare data and models you must do it on common signals. Then please rework your arguments.

I agree also with the comment of rev#1 that your message must be clearer. Finally you have the opportunity to have data and RCM simulations, you have to use this chance and to deepen your discussion with more mechanistic interpretation.

Best regards Joel Guiot

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., doi:10.5194/cp-2016-65, 2016.

CPD

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

