

## ***Interactive comment on “Mid-Holocene climate change over China: model-data discrepancy” by Yating Lin et al.***

**M.F. Loutre (Editor)**

marie-france.loutre@pages.unibe.ch

Received and published: 20 November 2018

Climate of the Past, as well as all the Copernicus journals recognize the essential importance of data sets, model code, samples, etc. as output of the research. They also insisted in FAIR (findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable) data. Along that line we invite the authors to provide essential additions to their paper.

### 1. Archiving data

Input data –

\* Ideally, the pollen assemblages for each of the 161 sites, at least for the 6 ka should be made available (e.g. in trusted archives). The biographic reference must be included for each of the sites. Many citations in Table 1 are not listed in the reference list.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



\* All the original data must be archived in a vetted repository and a citation should be linked to them.

\* climate simulations: the citations in Table 3 are not listed in the reference list. This should be amended.

Output data – the data used to draw figures 2-4 should be archived. In particular

\* all reconstructed climate variables and the biomes for each of the 161 sites at 6 ka (the values for the colored dots in Figs 2-4)

\* the simulated values for each of the climate variables (the colored bars in Figs. 2-4)

\* basic metadata for each site (the information listed in Table 1)

## 2. The "data availability" section

It should include the doi/url that links to the output data from this study and the reiterates the location of the input data (above). Alternatively, location of the input data can be provided in the table.

3. Of course, the authors might also want to make the digital data for their maps available, or anything that they think might be useful for future studies.

A special attention to the reference list is required. As it stands many references are missing (red in the attached file). The authors should also check lines 483, 637 and 694 of their reference list. Is CQPD 2000 or 2001 or both?

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.clim-past-discuss.net/cp-2018-145/cp-2018-145-EC1-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-145>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

