

## ***Interactive comment on “A Prequel to the Dantean Anomaly: The Water Seesaw and Droughts of 1302–1307 in Europe” by Martin Bauch et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 24 June 2020

This paper deals with a climate reconstruction for the period from 1290 to 1320 CE, focusing on droughts and dry years in this period. In addition, societal climate impacts in these years were discussed.

It is undoubtedly a very interesting paper with remarkable results. The methods are convincing and appropriate, the graphs are of good quality. I am sure that this paper is in many ways an important contribution to climate history of the late Middle Ages.

However, the paper has a rather unusual structure for a journal like Climate of the Past. Therefore, some changes would be highly recommended in this respect. The relevant information is actually all provided in the text, but it should be structured in a slightly different way. This should be possible with a minor revision.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



The introduction should better clarify the key question and objectives of the paper. Elements of this can now be found in several places. A short outline at the end of this introduction might also be useful.

In chapter 3, methods and results should be separated, as these chapters have a clear and distinct function which should not be mixed up. Elements of the methods are to be found throughout the chapter and would be more clearly presented and appreciated in a separate chapter before the results.

Comparisons with other existing series, such as the OWDA or Campbell 2007, could, however, be moved to the discussion section.

Most of the sections with climate responses, which is now in the discussion chapter, is actually part of the results, as far as I understand. If this is the case, it should be moved to the respective chapter.

It should also be made clearer where the long series of blazes for the statistical comparison come from. As I understand, this information is derived from the same sources as the other data (lines 253-254). If so, it would be useful to briefly describe in the methods section how this data was collected. If the majority of the data comes from the literature, this should be better indicated.

In the conclusion, comparisons with Japan, the Balkans, Catalonia, etc. appear for the first time. It would be better to present them in the discussion chapter first.

Perhaps, it might be worth considering whether the state of the art should refer to the work on droughts in Spain by Barriendos and others.

However, I congratulate the authors on these very interesting and important results and recommend that the structure of the paper be revised again with a view to clarity and logical sequence.

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2020-34>, 2020.