

Interactive comment on “Holocene Proxy Climate Series Should Account for the Site’s Elevation, the Variable’s Sensitivity to Elevation History and Time-lagged Effects: Three Examples” by David A. Fisher

D. Fisher

dafisher2@sympatico.ca

Received and published: 15 August 2018

Response to Editor of “Climate of the Past” and reviewers of “Holocene proxy climate series should account for the site’s elevation, the variable’s sensitivity to elevation history and time-lagged effects: three examples “: CC 2018 55 The ms was submitted as a discussion piece for the special issue “The 4.2ka BP Climatic Event” First, I thank the reviewers taking time to do their work. They both thought the ms did not contain anything new that had not been covered in some of my earlier papers. They are correct. But, I did not think that the discussion here needed to have new work presented.

C1

I have felt that the paleo -reconstruction community have implicitly assumed that site elevation and history need not be taken into account as a first order variable. Presenting three examples from the literature that show this assumption is false was the goal of the ms. I probably should have called them counterexamples that disprove the implicit constant-elevation-assumption. The ‘constant elevation implicit assumption’ is still used even over Holocene-long intervals, (eg. Briner et al.,2016) so I felt the discussion of its’ validity is relevant. Possibly the “Climate of the Past” was not the right outlet for the proceedings of a small conference. When confronted with the dilemma presented by the reviews, I made repeated and failed attempts to get in touch with a human in the editorial process for guidance. Now, I have too many commitments to meet the journals’ deadlines. In short please take my ms out of any further consideration for publishing. D Fisher Aug 14 2018

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-55>, 2018.

C2