

Interactive comment on “Three main stages in the uplift of the Tibetan Plateau during the Cenozoic period and its possible effects on Asian aridification: A review” by Zhixiang Wang et al.

Zhixiang Wang et al.

wangzhi8905@126.com

Received and published: 29 September 2018

1. Scientific significance: The authors do not provide new data, analysis, or concepts. The links between silicate weathering and CO₂ drawdown have been with us for multiple decades. The discussion of links between tectonic events on the Tibetan Plateau and climate events cherry-picks events and muddles their timing. In this study, we only summarized that the evidence of the age of the Tibetan Plateau, and the climatic variations of inland Asia. On this basis, we found that there are three distinct uplifts in the Tibetan Plateau. At the same time, the climate in Asia had a significant drying trend. Therefore, we proposed that the three main uplifts of the Tibetan Plateau

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



significantly affect the Asian inland aridification. Therefore, this manuscript was not provided new data and analysis. 2. Major comments : The authors need to clearly delineate time periods of interest. For example, currently all middle–late Miocene climate changes are lumped together, even though the original authors discriminate different mechanisms for climate changes within this period. Similarly, the Cretaceous paleoelevation history of the plateau is largely ignored. See comment on line 400 for an example. Documented uplift events and paleoelevation are not clearly correlative to climate shifts. For example see comment on lines 537–542. Data and conclusions are apparently reported largely without context or comment. This may be fine for an annotated bibliography, but for a review paper, some context and analysis of claims is needed. Otherwise, readers might as well go read all of the citations for themselves. The lack of critical analysis of the data obviates the need for this review. See comments on lines 68 or 397 for an example. Alternative explanations for the observed climate change are dismissed out of hand, without presentation of counter-evidence. We agree with the Reviewer suggestions. We have lumped together middle-late Miocene climate changes because numerous geological evidences show that the Tibetan Plateau has significant outward growth and uplifts of marginal mountains. In the original manuscript, we have emphasized the Cretaceous paleoelevation history (line 189-199). In the revised manuscript, we do not judge whether the results of the published papers are the right or wrong. We only summarized and concluded the evidence in the uplifts of the Tibetan Plateau and associated with climatic changes. Therefore, we do not comment, analyze and declare data and conclusions from the referenced articles. 3. Delete “the” before “Tibet” Line 16, 28, 517: Delete “the” before “uplift” Line 19, 26, 77, 277, 343: Replace “during” with “from” Line 20: Delete “n” in “Himalayan” Line 23: Delete “the” before “Eocene” Line 23–24: Delete “the” before “northern” Line 25: Delete “the” before “central” Line 39: The Cenozoic is an era. Done 4. Line 57: Why “was interpreted”? Reconsider verb tense. Corrected. 5. Line 66: Add “the” before “Lhasa” Line 68: What about the detrital zircon geochronology suggests that Indo- Asian collision occurred at that time? The authors need to provide sufficient

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

detail for readers to evaluate the claims without having to read the cited literature in its entirety. Corrected. The detrital zircon geochronology was used to constrain firmly the time when Asian-derived detritus was first deposited onto India. We have revised in the manuscript. 6. Line 69–72: This sentence does not make sense. Rewrite. We have deleted. 7. Line 80: Replace “activities” with “activity” Done 8. Line 82: Awkward. Rewrite. Corrected 9. Line 83: No caps on “Paleomagnetic” Corrected 10. Line 86: What paleomagnetic results? See comment on line 68. We have interpreted in the manuscript. The paleomagnetic results are from 43 sites of late Cretaceous red beds, 32 sites of late Cretaceous lava flows, and nine sites of Eocene tuffs. 11. Line 94: Begin this sentence with, “The second is: : :.” Done 12. Line 111: What “simulated” data? Line 115: Why “continued”? Is the plateau still being uplifted? Shortening simulation data and corrected it. We have deleted the “continued”. 13. Line 121–124: This is not accurate. In the models of Boos and Kuang, the Himalaya do not act as a heat pump, but rather act as a barrier which prevents cold and dry Asian air masses from penetrating southward into the Indian subcontinent. We have not said act as a heat pump and suggested orographic insulation. We have added a word “respectively” in the revised manuscript. 14. Line 139: This whole line of argumentation ignores recent evidence for high elevations in southern Tibet by the Late Cretaceous (e.g., Ding et al., 2014). We have emphasized and suggested in the original manuscript (line 189-199), and not ignored these results. 15. Line 143: Replace “by providing” with “due to” Done 16. Line 152: References? Lines Corrected. 17. 157–158: Basins and the Monsoon cannot have fossil leaf trait spectra. Rewrite. This is the result from the article (Spicer et al., 2016, EPSL) 18. Line 180: Delete “second” Done 19. Line 189: DeCelles et al. (2002) is not an appropriate reference here. Deleted. 20. Line 195: van Hinsbergen et al. (2011) do not present any balanced crosssections. Deleted. 21. Line 230: Change “offer a large amount for” to “would provide abundant”. Done 22. Line 236: Delete “the” before “thermal” Done 23. Line 237: The authors have not demonstrated that exhumation rates are correlated to surface uplift rates or absolute elevation. Corrected. 24. Line 244, 349: Delete “s” on “uplifts” Line 247: Delete “sea”.

Line 253–254: This sentence (particularly the second half of the sentence) is unclear. Rewrite. Done 25. Line 278: Insert “the” before “modern” Done 26. Line 345: Insert “the” before “late” Done 27. Line 345: What does “which” refer to? “which” refers to the retreat of the Paratethys Sea. 28. Line 360: This is an awkward sentence. Technically, the middle–late Miocene is part of a geological epoch, not “a fundamental change in earth’s (sic) climate system”. Corrected 29. Line 365: Awkward. Rewrite. Corrected 30. Line 397: This is a case in a general point that the authors need to provide more details for readers to be able to evaluate the claims. No mention is made of the depositional setting where this change in CO₂ content was observed. Without these details, the reader is forced to find and read the relevant literature, obviating the need for this review. Corrected. 31. Line 400: What time period are the authors referring to? Hough et al. (2014) observe a regional increase in aridity at 14Ma, but a basin – specific increase in aridity at 10Ma. We suggested the age of 14 – 8Ma interval. We have emphasized this in the manuscript. 32. Line 537 – –542 : *The timing of these climatic shifts in the early Cenozoic is not clearly correlated to paleo-elevation of the Tibetan Plateau. The scale of South Asian summer monsoon circulation is unaffected (Boos and Kuang, 2010, Nature). Therefore, we guess that the –54 : Again, if these regions were elevated by the Late Cretaceous, what is the driver for initiation of the monsoon in the early C. Seems ad hoc. CO₂ draw-down is attributed to uplift-induced silicate weathering, but up-ticks in CO₂ concentration are unrelated. The Tibetan Plateau is a big place. What parts of the Tibetan Plateau in specific are the author talking about? The northern margin*

Please also note the supplement to this comment :

<https://www.clim-past-discuss.net/cp-2018-64/cp-2018-64-AC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-64>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

