

Interactive comment on “Wildfire history of the boreal forest of southwestern Yakutia (Siberia) over the last two millennia documented by a lake-sedimentary charcoal record” by Ramesh Glückler et al.

Ramesh Glückler et al.

ramesh.glueckler@awi.de

Received and published: 19 February 2021

Dear Sandy Harrison,

thank you for summarizing the issues you would have us pay special attention to. We fully agree that the review comments are very constructive and provide well-founded advice to improve the manuscript, and help to better communicate the underlying uncertainties constraining the interpretation of this study. Regarding the listed issues, you can find the most detailed answers in our responses to the following individual review

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



comments:

For 1) the reliability of the chronology and the impact of chronological uncertainties on the conclusions: RC1, as well as RC3

For 2) the appropriateness of the calculated fire return intervals: RC1

For 3) the re-sampling methodology and its impact on the results: SC1

For 4) how/why the fire peak analysis differs from conventional methods and the impact of this on the reliability of the reconstructions: RC1

For 5) the vegetation data used and particularly the degree to which underrepresentation of key pollen types is likely to have impacted your conclusions: RC2

With best regards

Ramesh Glückler

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2020-415>, 2020.

BGD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

