

Interactive comment on “Modelling tree-ring cellulose $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ variations of two temperature-sensitive tree species from North and South America” by Aliénor Lavergne et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 18 September 2017

The authors test the MAIDENiso model in regard to O-isotope fractionation with “temperature-sensitive” tree species in Quebec and from Patagonia (which I interpret as ring growth being sensitive to temperature). In the case of the Canadian site, the high latitude indicates temperature sensitivity, whereas for the Argentina site the elevation probably contributes more to the temperature sensitivity. A number of parameters in the mechanistic models must be estimated, among which the estimated $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ of precipitation may have the greatest uncertainty, but parameters are also tested for sensitivity in simulating the observed tree-ring $\delta^{18}\text{O}$. The authors found that xylem water $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ is less influential than leaf evaporative enrichment in predicting tree-ring $\delta^{18}\text{O}$. Furthermore, temperature effects are more related to effect on leaf evaporative enrich-

C1

ment that T effects on precipitation isotopes.

The analysis is important and results reasonable, although there are some large $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ differences in the actual tree-ring composition between the N. American and S. American sites.

p. 35, ‘tree rings’ p. 101-102, ‘which is an angiosperm deciduous species dominating’ p. 111-112, ‘In western Argentina, precipitation is largely concentrated from late fall to early spring followed by a drier and mild period during summer and early fall’... isn’t late fall to early spring summer in Argentina, and therefore the following ‘mild period’ would be during the Argentina winter and early spring? p. 188, ‘for N. pumilio, and therefore the’ 216-217, ‘we also used modelled daily data from the GCMs described above for both the western Argentinian and northeastern Canadian sites’ 221-222, ‘For the years 1950-1957,’ 240 (and 159), the authors refer to ‘dampening factor fo’, but Eqn 1 suggests it is actually the fraction of the tree-ring $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ signal that derives from xylem water... perhaps they are synonymous? 287, in “temperature and precipitation dependences”, the authors seem to mean “temperature and precipitation coefficients”, i.e., a and b. 289, “more strongly” 319, what is the “reference one”? perhaps “reference simulations”? 320, what is the “source one”? perhaps “than are the XW_source simulations”? 325, what does “these results are limited upstream” mean? 341-342, change “ratio in a high amount of precipitated water” to “ratio increased higher precipitation” 362-363, why is it ‘interesting(ly)’ that “the $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ signal in northeastern Canada is comparatively more depleted than in western Argentina”. Given the latitude of northeastern Canada, I would expect $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ to be isotopically lighter. 363, “northeast” 385-386, “GNIP stations” 434-435, “tree growth is inhibited, leading to a decrease of” 465, “tree rings” 719, are the “mean simulated $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ TR levels” (here in caption and in B y-axis labels) actually “ $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ TR values”? or “ $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ TR output”

REFERENCES The “13”s and “18”s in isotope designations in titles need to be superscripted. DeNiro and Epstein 1979, Rozanski et al. 1993, Yakir and Deniro references: too many words in title begin with upper-case letters

C2

Figure 4, shouldn't the label on the y-axis be "kernel density"?

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2017-93>, 2017.