

Interactive comment on “A 22 570 yr record of vegetational and climatic change from Wenhai Lake in the Hengduan Mountains biodiversity hotspot, Yunnan, Southwest China” by Y. F. Yao et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 30 September 2014

In general, the review of the article is positive, but major improvements are necessary before the manuscript can be considered for publication: Line 017: Why to mention: “This paper is one of the studies.” This paper and the results must be able to stand alone, it sounds like an excuse! Line 031: I’m a bit astonished that from 9,250 cal. Yr BP to present no major changes were highlighted although Fig. 2 documents noteworthy changes. Line 042: lie seems a not-quite correct term Line 073-076: The statement could be proven within the entire manuscript! Clear evidences are missing. Line 103: “densata Mast.” are “also present” Line 153: Results – this is the weakest

C5558

part of the manuscript in terms of interpretation!! Line 157: there is no “chronological control against which to decipher the vegetation and climate history”. There is only a listing what might have happened within the different Pollen Zones, but an interpretation and/or a comparison to recent conditions is missing!!! Line 278: The discussion and the conclusions have to be improved deeply. The visual differences between Zone 1 and Zone 3 are not so clear, but the “interpretation” of the climate conditions are quite different. Zone 2, in between, shows completely different climatic and vegetative conditions, but there is no interpretation or any comparison to other published studies.

According to this, chapter 5 (from Line 278 onwards) has to be improved tremendously. The results and this paper must be able to stand alone in contrast to the authors prediction that they “published the first of a series of studies. ...”

Major revisions of the manuscript are necessary.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 11, 13433, 2014.

C5559