

Interactive comment on “Millennial-scale precipitation variability over Easter Island (South Pacific) during MIS 3: inter-hemispheric teleconnections with North Atlantic abrupt cold events” by O. Margalef et al.

M. Claussen (Editor)

martin.claussen@mpimet.mpg.de

Received and published: 23 July 2015

Dear Dr Margalef,

Thank you very much for your response to reviewer 1 and 2. You also sent a revised manuscript as an author comment prior to the editor's decision. This is not in line with the editorial process. Hence I will ignore your revision for a moment to focus on your reply only.

Both reviewers appreciate the topic of your research. They highlight that your paper

C1144

is of relevance for Climate of the Past, and they consider it highly interesting for the broad palaeoclimatic community in principle. Both reviewers raise, however, serious concerns regarding the quality of reconstruction, specifically regarding the chronostratigraphy. The latter seems to be poorly constrained, making your interpretation and conclusions vague to say the least. Reviewer 1 goes a step further by questioning the originality of your data and statistics. He/she mentions that you published your data earlier and that you did not improve your age model. Hence your interpretations would just reflect expectations based on an abundant literature linking rainfall in the southern tropics and Heinrich events. Reviewer 2 refers to your paper published in 2013 when making suggestions for any improvement – not a good hint regarding the originality of your present study. Basically in line with the first reviewer, the second reviewer concludes that he/she would be much more willing to accept your results if you could demonstrate that you have improved accuracy and precision of your the chronostratigraphy. In your reply to the reviewer, you emphasize that the main purpose of your study is to contextualize your previous findings with the regional pattern of Southern Central Pacific. You admit that the chronology of your records is uncertain, but you claim that your age model, although it has not significantly improved, is good enough to provide a sound base for discussion. The main outcome of your manuscript is “that with even the imperfect but always independent chronologies, a series of events can be correlated ...”.

I am not sure that your arguments are convincing. However, since I am not a proxy expert, I will ask the reviewers whether your reply has addressed their concerns sufficiently such that a revised version is likely to substantially improve your paper.

Best regards

Martin Claussen

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., 11, 1407, 2015.

C1145