

Interactive comment on “A 125-year record of climate and chemistry variability at the Pine Island Glacier ice divide, Antarctica” by Franciele Schwanck et al.

J. Savarino (Editor)

joel.savarino@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

Received and published: 23 January 2017

Dear Authors

I have read the interactive comments and I should warn you that at this stage I'm not convinced by your replies. Both reviewers draw serious critics about the data treatment and interpretations during the first stage of the review process. I did not find your replies convincing and they lack details. Most of the time, the replies refer and point to change made in the revised version but none of the reviewers have access to it, neither me at the time of writing.

I would like to see the change that you intend to do (or did in the revised version) right

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



in your replies to the reviewer's comments and not systematically pointing to a revised manuscript. Also I would like to see all questions and comments of the reviewers addressed in your replies. For instance, R2 asked What's the sensitivity of your results when using the other reanalysis datasets? Question that is not answered in your reply.

The interactive public discussion stage does not allow to look at a revised version. Therefore all anticipated changes should be clearly stated, with details in the reply to reviewer's comments.

Sincerely,

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., doi:10.5194/tc-2016-242, 2016.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

