

Interactive comment on “Reconstructions of biomass burning from sediment charcoal records to improve data-model comparisons” by J. R. Marlon et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 25 February 2016

This is an important and well written paper which clearly describes the limitations of using charcoal records as well as its potential for future research. The methodology is very clear and reproducible and the accessibility of this database will no doubt lead to further research in this field. I fully recommend its publication in Biogeosciences with some minor suggested revisions listed below.

Clarification on the use of multiple records for the same site would be useful. As it is, it appears as if the same records have been counted multiple times, thus creating false duplicates. If this is the case due to the use of multiple metrics and techniques, wouldn't it be preferable to create one record either through amalgamating or averaging

C9956

the different records, or by choosing the record that is deemed most reliable, if such a distinction can be made?

Technical corrections:

P21|12-13: references repeated.

P10|17: "...be of tectonic..."(of added)

P11|11: refer to table 3.

P11|27: refer to figure 2?

P14|22: "...again fitted to the pooled..."(-ted added)

P19|9: remove of from: "compared of paleofire trends..."

P26|5: space in wrong place: "...high levels of burning overt he..."

Table 2: What are the size categories?

Figures 9 and 10: not referred to in the text, figure 9 would fit in on page 10, but the figures would then need to be renumbered. In addition, the units are missing from the small size definition for figure 10.

Supplementary figures do not appear to be in any discernible order, putting these in chronological order would ease viewing by the readers. In addition, one of the plots is marked -500-500 BP. I assume this should read -50-500 BP?

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 12, 18571, 2015.

C9957