

Interactive comment on “Age of the Tibetan ice cores” by Shugui Hou et al.

P. A. Mayewski (Referee)

paul.mayewski@maine.edu

Received and published: 25 May 2018

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of TC? – Yes, it calls into question conclusions based on the interpretation of a single water soluble ^{36}Cl measurement that has been used to provide a reference point in following publications to assert timing and extent of past glacial age ice cover and associated climate interpretations. 2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? Yes it provides an impressive rationale and data assembly for dating a relatively new Tibetan ice core record – Chongce. 3. Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes, the authors present a clear and straightforward comparison of existing Tibetan ice core records. 4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes. 5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? The interpretations and conclusions are based on significant spatial and temporal data and the basic conclusion is very professionally stated calling for more work, ideally similar to that

C1

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



presented in this paper, re dating of the Guliya ice core. 6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes 7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes 8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes 9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes 10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Absolutely. 11. Is the language fluent and precise? Yes 12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Yes 13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No. 14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes. 15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? Yes.

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/tc-2018-55>, 2018.

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