

Interactive comment on “Arctic hydroclimate variability during the last 2000 years – current understanding and research challenges” by Hans W. Linderholm et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 17 April 2017

The overall quality of the discussion paper "Arctic hydroclimate variability during the last 2000 years – current understanding and research challenges" intended for the Special Issue "Climate of the past 2000 years: global and regional syntheses", is good. The manuscript presents a substantial, thorough, and updated contribution on hydroclimate variability during the past 2 ka in the Arctic. The concepts, ideas, methods, and data from different climate archives are clearly presented. The results are discussed in an appropriate and balanced way, including appropriate references. The scientific results and conclusions are presented in a clear, concise, and well structured way. The number and quality of figures and tables are appropriate, as well as the English language.

Specific comment: Please note that Lake Nerfloen listed in Table 2 is located in western

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Norway, not Northern (N) Norway.

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of CP? YES 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? YES 3. Are substantial conclusions reached? YES 4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? YES 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? YES 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? YES 7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? YES 8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? YES 9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? YES 10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? YES 11. Is the language fluent and precise? YES 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? YES 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? NO 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? YES 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? YES

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., doi:10.5194/cp-2017-34, 2017.

CPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

