

Interactive comment on “Clay mineralogical evidence for mid-latitude terrestrial climate change from the latest Cretaceous through the earliest Paleogene in the Songliao Basin, NE China” by Yuan Gao et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 9 April 2020

My general comments on Gao et al. "Clay mineralogical evidence for mid-latitude terrestrial climate change from the latest Cretaceous through the earliest Paleogene in the Songliao Basin, NE China" are summarized here. The Earth's climate state of late Cretaceous was characterized by high atmospheric CO₂ and global warmth. Significantly, the late Cretaceous era is a key period for biotic evolution. However, our knowledge of Earth's state during this period is mostly from marine records, owing to a lack of well-dated high-resolution terrestrial records. The paper by Gao et al. presents well-dated high-resolution clay mineralogical records of the Upper Cretaceous and Lower

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Paleocene terrestrial deposition from the Songliao Basin, northeastern China. Their data shown that the relative percentages of the clay minerals were mainly controlled by regional paleoclimate and sedimentary environment, and they utilized three clay mineralogical proxies for paleoclimatic reconstruction. They found these proxies varied sensitively in responded to global climate changes during the latest Cretaceous to the earliest Paleogene. Their clay mineral data provide independent evidence for climate changes through the latest Cretaceous to the earliest Paleogene from the Songliao Basin, and would shed light on further investigations in biotic evolutionary during this period. The layout of this paper is good and the writing is in good shape. As such, I think this paper deserves to be published in *Climate of the Past* and potentially to be interested by a wide range of readers, albeit some aspects are still need to be improved. The following are some weak points that in my opinion should be addressed to improve the paper.

My main issue with the study is that the authors have to further justify their clay mineralogical proxies are reliable proxies for paleoclimatic reconstruction. In fact, in addition to climate and weathering, many other factors, such as provenance, recycling of sedimentary parent rocks, transport processes, and depositional environments, all could influence the type and proportion of clay minerals. I suggest the authors to evaluate to what extent these factors have influenced their clay mineralogical proxies.

Lines 24-26: These clay minerals can be also sourced from recycled sedimentary parent rocks. How to preclude this? See the comment above.

Lines 97-106: What are the new contributions of this paper beyond Gao et al. (2013; 2015b)?

Lines 106-108: I suggest the authors to mark the published data in their figs. 2, 4, and 5.

Lines 423-429: If the clay mineral proxies can only response to the long-duration climate events (>200 kyrs), then how to explain such many minima in their clay mineral-

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

ogy proxies (such as percent of smectite, illite, and ratio of smectite/illite) in the figs. 2, 4, and 5?

Fig. 2: I suggest to 1) add the published observed magnetozones to geomagnetic polarity timescale (GPTS), 2) legend for lithostratigraphy, and 3) include labels like a), b), c) for the subplots.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2020-36>, 2020.

CPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

