

***Interactive comment on* “Climate indices in historical climate reconstructions: A global state-of-the-art” by David J. Nash et al.**

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 8 November 2020

This paper provides a review of the work done when trying to convert documentary evidences into ordinal or quantitative indices. There are two aims: ‘provide a global state-of-the-art review of the development and application of the index approach in historical climate reconstruction’ and ‘identify best practice for future investigations’. After the introduction sections 2-9 review the previous work done in the different world areas, while section 10 provides some recommendations for future work.

I think that the paper is rather successful in the first objective but fails in achieving the second one because the abundant description of previous work included in sections 2-9 is not followed by a critical analysis in section 10. I provide details below.

Regarding objective one, the review is exhaustive reflecting most of the previous work based on ordinal indices that consider the departure from normality as the main crite-

tion to produce an anomaly scale with several levels of intensity. However, references to other approaches to build ordinal indices are missing. For instance, several papers have built ENSO chronologies from documentary evidences from different areas of S America reporting different impacts associated to ENSO (Quinn and Neal, 1992; Ortlieb 2000; Garcia-Herrera et al 2008). In my view this type of approach should also be acknowledged in the paper.

Lines 777-778 In the recent years directional wind indices over the oceans have gone beyond decadal reconstructions of wind force trends, as stated in the paper. This methodology has allowed the generation of the longest series of the wind circulation in the North Atlantic and generating new indices for circulation patterns as the NAO or the East Atlantic pattern (Mellado-Cano et al 2020). Besides, they have been useful in studying different features of the global monsoon system: the impact of volcanic eruptions on the West African Summer monsoon during the 19th century (Gallego et al 2015), the onset of the Indian Summer Monsoon (Ordoñez et al 2016) or secular trends in the Australian Summer Monsoon (Gallego et al 2017) among others.

Lines 865-873. Over the Oceans the uncertainties associated to the limited sampling in a given area and period have been also quantified, see for instance Gallego et al (2015).

In my view the second objective is not achieved because there is not a critical analysis of the work described in sections 2-9. Consequently, the link from the recorded evidences to the identification of the best practices is missing. This should have been done in section 10, but this is again very descriptive. Tables 5-7 do not identify best practice, instead they just summarize the variables studied in every region or the number of classes used. Having missed this analytical part, many of the statements lack of support. The authors claim that they are based on two previous reviews and ‘also incorporate insights from this study’. This is not evident at all from the text, because of this lack of critical analysis in the manuscript. For instance (lines 950-952) why do the authors “recognise that the most widely used approaches such as the Pfister method

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

would require modification to be useful for temperature and/or rainfall reconstruction in all regions”? Which of the previous papers are the support of this statement? What are the main reasons for this recognition? The authors do not provide any evidence of the limitations of these approaches and they should do it based on their extensive previous review. Is it because indices derived from a certain type of documents and for a given climate cannot be applied mimetically to different documentary sources and climates? If so, the authors should provide supporting evidence. Otherwise this is just their opinion.

I find several problems with the guidelines. Firstly, they should be clearly supported from the previous review, which is not the case. The review should allow identifying best practices and the analysis of these cases should lead to the guidelines, but this sequence is not followed in the paper. Best practices are not identified, and, consequently, guidelines are not supported by them.

Additionally, I think that a climate component is missing in some of the guidelines. According to my previous experience, the final indexation should be a compromise among the historical records characteristics, their availability and the climate of the region to be studied. The mere translation of indices built for a certain climate to other areas may lead to biases or inadequacies if applied to other regions. For example, the translation of precipitation indices developed for central Europe should be applied with care to Mediterranean climates, where most of the precipitation is concentrated between September and April and occurs mostly in the form of a few intense events.

Thus, I think that guideline 2 could be rephrased from: Researchers should be familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of each of their historical sources prior to their use in climate reconstruction. To something as: Researchers should be familiar with the local climate and the strengths and weaknesses of each of their historical sources prior to their use in climate reconstruction.

Guideline 3 reads: “Researchers should select an appropriate temporal resolution for

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

their index series according to the quantity and richness (in terms of climate information) of available historical sources. This may be monthly, seasonal, annual or longer, although for information-rich areas, a monthly resolution is the most desirable.” Again the climate factor is missing, for instance if you build monthly series for precipitation in the Mediterranean, you should be aware that during the dry months, the signal-to-noise ratio should be very low and this can bias the results. This guideline should be rephrased, as, for example: “Researchers should select an appropriate temporal resolution for their index series according to the quantity and richness (in terms of climate information) of available historical sources and the local climate. This may be monthly, seasonal, annual or longer, although for information-rich areas, a monthly resolution is desirable depending on the climate type and variable studied.”

Guideline 4 reads: “Whether to develop a three-, five- or seven- (or more) point index series will also depend upon data quantity and quality but may be influenced by the legacy of previous studies in a region if direct comparisons are required”. Two comments here. I do not understand the mention to the previous legacy, I find this confusing. Do you mean that things should be done as they were done in the past, just to compare? Even if you have identified problems in the legacy? This needs to be clarified. Applying previous indexation without a careful examination of its adequacy to a given climate and data set is not a good practice. Apart from this, a mention to the climate is also required, since the number of points in the scale may also depend on the type of climate and climate variable studied. So, for instance, this could read something as: “Whether to develop a three-, five- or seven- (or more) point index series will also depend upon data quantity and quality, the local climate and climate variable to be indexed”.

Guideline 9 reads “To maximise their wider usefulness, index series should, ideally, overlap with runs of local or regional instrumental data to permit calibration and verification. Where instrumental data are not available, overlaps with independent high-resolution palaeoclimate records may be used for calibration” I think that using palaeo-

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

climate proxies to calibrate an index is not the best recommendation. These proxies have their own weaknesses and uncertainties and using them as the 'truth' to calibrate an index may introduce unexpected biases. Calibrating an index with a proxy, implies two transfer functions from the variable to the proxy and from the proxy to the index, posing additional uncertainties. I think that a comparison with proxies is fine, but using them to calibrate is far too dangerous.

Summing up, I think that the paper requires an extensive revision before being acceptable for publication. The good practices need to be well identified in the text and the support of the guidelines must be clearly linked to the previous evidence. The authors have made a highly valuable effort in compiling the previous work. Improving the analysis by better illustrating the good practices and providing a clear background and support to the guidelines, would lead to a highly interesting paper, but these issues need to be solved.

Minor issue Some of the authors references are made in a strange way. For instance, line 455 'Garza Merodio who was a student of ...' Is this so relevant? Why are not the other academic linkages mentioned? To me this is relevant if you want to tell the history of the researchers involved in this topic, which is not the case. Line 401 'the work of Coleen Vogel'. Line 407, 'Sharon Nicholson' and several others. Why some authors are cited by their full names (not the usual practice) and other just by the surname? Not clear to me.

Gallego, D., Ordóñez, P., Ribera, P., Peña-Ortiz, C., and García-Herrera, R.: An instrumental index of the West African Monsoon back to the 19th century, *Q. J. Roy. Meteor. Soc.*, 141, 3166-3176, doi: 10.1002/qj.2601, 2015. Gallego D. García-Herrera R., Peña-Ortiz C. and Ribera P. 'The steady increase of the Australian Summer Monsoon in the last 200 years'. *Scientific Reports*, 7, Article number: 16166. 2017. doi:10.1038/s41598-017-16414-1. García-Herrera R., Díaz H.F., García R.R., Prieto M.R., Barriopedro D., Moyano R., Hernández, E. (2008): A chronology of El Niño events from primary documentary sources in Northern Peru. *Journal of Climate*,

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

21, 9, 1948-1962, doi: 10.1175/2007JCLI1830.1. Mellado-Cano J., Barriopedro D., García-Herrera R., Trigo R., Hernández A., (2019): Examining the North Atlantic Oscillation, East Atlantic Pattern, and Jet Variability since 1685, *Journal of Climate*, 32, 6285–6298, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-19-0135.1> Mellado-Cano J., Barriopedro D., García-Herrera R., Trigo R., (2020): New observational insights into the atmospheric circulation over the Euro-Atlantic sector since 1685, *Climate Dynamics*, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-019-05029-z> Ordóñez P, David Gallego, Pedro Ribera, Cristina Peña-Ortiz and Ricardo García-Herrera. 'Tracking the Indian Summer Monsoon onset back to the pre-instrumental period'. *J. Climate*, 29 (22), 8115-8127, 2016. doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-15-0788.1. Ortlieb, L., 2000: The documentary historical record of El Niño events in Peru: An update of the Quinn record. *El Niño and the Southern Oscillation: Multiscale Variability and Global and Regional Impacts*, H. F. Diaz and V. Markgraf, Eds., Cambridge University Press, 207–297 Quinn W, and V.T. Neal, 1992: The historical record of El Niño events. *Climate Since A.D. 1500*, R. S. Bradley and P. D. Jones, Eds., Routledge, 623–648

Interactive comment on *Clim. Past Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2020-126>, 2020.

CPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

