

## ***Interactive comment on “Stalagmite-inferred abrupt climate change of Asian Summer Monsoon at MIS 5a/4 transition” by Xiuyang Jiang et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 28 December 2017

This manuscript presents a well dated speleothem isotope record from southern China, covering the period from 79.0 to 75.7 kyr BP. The high uranium concentration and low detritus thorium contamination ensure the high-precision chronology for this record and highlight the determination of the transition age of the CIS 21. However, the authors only briefly mentioned that this record confirms the previous comparisons and potential linkages with high-latitude climate changes and there is no more discussion on the climate changes and its scientific significance during this period in the manuscript. This makes the manuscript a report on the results, but not a research article. So, it may be more suitable for journal of “Scientific Reports” or “Quaternary Geochronology”, and the title should be changed to “Improved chronology of Chinese interstadial 21”, or something like that.

C1

The authors used the RAMPFIT to determine the transition, and then the termination of CIS 21. It was suggested that the termination of CIS 21 occurred at the mid-point of the transition. As seen from figure 6, the speleothem  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  persistently increased from 77.0 kyr BP to 75.7 ka BP, implying the transition could be defined as from 77.0 to 75.7 ka BP, albeit there are some high-frequent oscillations. Is this caused by the selection of time period for RAMPFIT analyzing, or it is the real output of RAMPFIT analysis for the whole record?

typo, page 8 line 14, a 1.2-yr-long warming interval, the 1.2-yr should be ‘1.2 kyr’

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2017-144>, 2017.

C2