

Interactive comment on “Comparing the spatial patterns of climate change in the 9th and 5th millennia B.P. from TRACE-21 model simulations” by Liang Ning et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 November 2018

In this manuscript, the authors compared the spatial patterns of global temperature, precipitation, and SST during two centennial-scale droughts during the Holocene based on model simulation. The similarities and differences between these two drought events, which are believed to be caused by different reasons, are examined in details. The authors also hypothesized that the drought during the 5th millennium B.P. is caused by a reduction in the AMOC due to the long-term changes in insolation related to precessional forcing, which passed a threshold around 4.5 ka B.P. This manuscript covers two important topics: one topic is the detailed spatial patterns during the 4.2 ka BP event, which could be used for comparison with proxy reconstructions, and the other topic is mechanisms behind the 4.2 ka B.P., which are interesting to the whole

C1

paleoclimate community. So, I believe this manuscript should be interesting to a wide audience of Climate of the Past. Some interesting results and meaningful conclusions are shown in this manuscript, and the analyses are straightforward and clear, however, I still have some comments regarding the manuscript listed below. Therefore, I would recommend that the present manuscript may be accepted for publication after some minor revisions. 1. The numbering of the manuscript needs to be re-arranged, for example “Results” should be Section 3 rather than Section 2.1. 2. More details of the TRACE-21 experiments should be provided for the readers, such as the external forcing used in the experiments. 3. The authors claim that the 4.2 ka BP event was one of the several late Holocene centennial-scale fluctuations, have they compared the timing of these fluctuations with the Bond events? Do they have some similarities? 4. Line 198, considering the 5th millennium BP event as the start of the Neoglacial is a really interesting topic, which should be strengthened with more discussion. 5. In Fig. 1, the dash lines are the means, right? The authors should add this information into the caption. 6. In the figure captions, the time “4500 ka BP” should be “4.5 ka BP”, and also other similar timings. 7. In the caption of Fig. 7, the phase “shown in dark blue” is obscure, and should be revised.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-132>, 2018.

C2