

Interactive comment on “Simple noise estimates and pseudoproxies for the last 21k years” by Oliver Bothe et al.

Oliver Bothe et al.

ol.bothe@gmail.com

Received and published: 1 February 2019

Dear referees, dear editor,

we would like to thank you for your constructive and relevant comments on our manuscript.

In the following, we address your comments and suggestions. Our answers are in red font color while your comments are in normal font. Where feasible we will shortly outline our planned modifications to a revised manuscript for the case such revisions are invited. Where the direction of our revisions is clear, we will add tentative changes to the text.

We would like to thank you once more for your help.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



On behalf of the authors,
Sincerely yours,
Oliver Bothe

ESSDD

[Interactive
comment](#)

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Response to referees

Referee 1:

General Comments

In their manuscript, Bothe et al. provides a flexible approach to take into consideration noise in forward models of paleoclimate proxies, i.e. pseudoproxies. Although the need for these pseudo proxy models is increasing, I'm unclear as of how the present study adds to the growing body of methods available, including the recent SedProxy toolbox of Dolman and Laepple referenced by the author.

We appreciate the referee's concerns about the originality and usefulness of our manuscript, the chosen approach, and the data sets. We are glad that the referee at least acknowledges that current research directions require or at least benefit from the development of pseudoproxy approaches.

Traditional pseudoproxy applications over the Common Era of the last 2,000 years started from, and mainly still rely on, simple noise-based pseudoproxies. Thus, while there is the need of complex mechanistically modelled pseudoproxies, the last 20 years have shown that paleoclimatology benefits from having access to multiple pseudoproxy generating algorithms.

Pseudoproxies may help in understanding proxy systems, testing reconstruction methods, evaluating simulations among another and against proxies, and in testing data assimilation techniques.

Regarding the work by Dolman and Laepple, we note that the present work developed parallel to their approach. From our point of view, our code and data complement their proxy system models from a more general point of view. Additionally, we would argue that we make differing or additional assumptions compared to Dolman and Laepple.

There are some major differences to the approach of Dolman and Laepple:

- The level of complexity of the different approaches
- The generalization of our approach including non-marine proxy archives.

Generally, our approach can be seen as complementary to the one of Dolman and Laepple and used as an independent source for the generation of pseudoproxies.

Having said this, we are going to argue in favor of the originality and the usefulness of our data. Originality of research may refer to hypotheses reported, methods used, and results obtained (Dirk, 1999, www.jstor.org/stable/285800). Morgan (1985, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1346489) reformulates originality as "independent or creative in thought or action". Research usually does not start from zero but refers to previous work. Independence and novelty, thus, are always relative and depend on the context.

In the present case of a manuscript that provides a data set, the questions could be, following Dirk (1999), how new is the method, and how new are the data (which is the result in this case). Considering the chosen approach, we would argue that we obviously rely on previous thinking on paleoproxies and indeed part of the work relies on discussions with colleagues like Dolman, Laepple, and Weitzel, which we have to acknowledge. However, to our knowledge, there is no publication presenting a simple noise-based pseudoproxy for deglacial and longer time-scales. There is definitely no publication using our specific approach, and, to our knowledge, there is no publication providing pseudoproxies or even ensembles of pseudoproxies for full simulation output fields for easy usage.

Regarding the potential usefulness of our data, there are two things to consider. First, is our data readily usable? As referee 3 notes, this is apparently not necessarily the case and we have to try to improve on this. Second, is the data by itself of value?

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

The data, as it is, can be used to test data assimilation methods as well as other reconstruction methods, to evaluate the TraCE-21ka simulation against old and new proxy data, and to test model-data comparison methods. Using our code allows to produce comparable proxies for other simulations and, e.g., additionally to compare these different simulations among another. Is our data worse or better suited than other pseudoproxies for these purposes? We provide an alternative, which we think worthwhile and usable.

I would not recommend the manuscript for publication in this present stage.

We appreciate the referee's comments and hope that our responses are sufficient to change this assessment.

In particular, I suggest the authors make the following points clearer in their revisions: The work seems to rely on the concept of proxy system introduced by Evans et al. (2013). A proxy system is composed of an archive, a sensor, and an observation (measurement in the present manuscript). Each components can be modeled independently to obtain the full proxy system model.

We are unclear what the referee refers to.

Indeed, our work relies on the concepts introduced by Evans et al. We agree, that a proxy system can be thought of as including (at least) a sensor, an archive and the observation.

If the referee implies that each has to be modelled separately, then we disagree. In our understanding, this would disqualify VSLite as proxy system model. Similarly, the approach of Thompson et al. (2011) would then not qualify either. If the referee means that it is possible to formulate models for each of the components of a proxy system in the sense of Evans et al., then we do not see their concern, as we precisely follow this approach.

Proxy systems model extend to age determination methods and I'm unsure as whether

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

it was singled out in this manuscript.

We are unsure what the referee refers to. Thus, our following response may miss the point.

Our aim is to provide a pseudoproxy-setup that adds a noise-based error-term for the time-uncertainty to the discrete time-series of the pseudoproxy instead of providing a tuple of uncertainties for the tuple of time and data. Our rationale is that this helps in model-evaluation, model-data comparisons, and reconstruction exercises. In a sense, we single this out as we regard this to be important. It may very well be we address a problem that is not of importance to people working on the proxies but in our understanding it is of importance for model-data comparison and evaluation of different model simulations.

Ideally, in order to fully represent the uncertainty in the proxy, one would want to use a proxy system model for the time axis (e.g, radiocarbon in foraminifera shells) and y-axis (e.g., Mg/Ca in foraminiferal shell). In this particular example, the archive and sensor model would be common to the x-axis and y-axis. The observation model would need to be tailored to the particular measurement.

If we understand the referee's point correctly, we agree on the optimal proxy system representation. However, we explicitly aim at (i) a simplified representation and (ii) a representation that results in a time-series with associated errors where the error term also accounts for date uncertainty.

The back and forth between age uncertainties and environmental variable uncertainties in the manuscript is confusing.

We are sorry for this and we will try to make our points more clearly in the manuscript by clarifying our terminology.

I'm also unclear on how this model is fully generalizable since each type of observations made on this archive (e.g., Mg/Ca in foraminifera shells or UK37) would have

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

specific “noise” associated with them which would need to be modeled individually.

Various sensors, various archives, and various observations, that is various proxies differ but also share common properties. In this sense we try to formulate a general model that assists in reconstruction method tests, model evaluation, and the evaluation of model-data comparisons.

The authors keep referring to “non-climatic noise”. Climatic noise is also included in the proxy records and is often impossible to disentangle from the other sources of noise discussed in the manuscript.

The referee is correct and we have to clarify this.

Specific comments:

Introduction: The concepts of proxy systems and proxy systems models need to be introduced earlier and a description of how the current work fits into these larger concepts need to be included.

We introduce proxy systems and proxy system models now earlier in the introduction and also relate our approach to this setting. This requires a restructuring of the introduction, therefore we do not yet include our additions here.

Please also include a discussion on how the present approach is different from the slew of studies on proxy system models and what it adds to the table.

We discuss this more in the introduction. This requires a restructuring of the introduction, therefore we do not yet include our additions here.

Page 2, line 13: A proxy system is a mathematical representation of the proxy, including the error. How is this a second way. I’m also unsure how the noise is not observation specific?

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



We try to clarify our thinking as follows:

In our understanding there are various approaches to obtain pseudoproxies. These range from most comprehensive to most simplified. We can try to obtain a comprehensive representation from the environmental influences on a sensor to the measurement and implement this into a mechanistic forward model of the proxy system of interest. Such models can be more complex or they may concentrate on a core set of processes (compare the full and reduced implementations of the Vaganov-Shashkin approach to modelling tree-rings presented by, e.g., Evans et al., 2006, Tolwinski-Ward et al., 2011). That is, the first approach to obtaining pseudoproxies is process based. Other, more reduced approaches potentially ignore this mechanistic process understanding and focus on stochastic expressions of the noise that influence our inferences about past climates. Such an approach can try to formulate mathematically tractable expressions for statistical noise-terms, which represent the different processes or effects influencing the stages from the original environmental influence to our final observation [Dolman et al., in preparation]. Another way of producing pseudoproxies by focussing on stochastic noise expressions uses simple estimates of plausible errors. The different approaches can be very general or specific for certain proxy types. They can focus on one stage of the proxy system from environment to measurement or consider more or even all stages. Indeed, all these approaches fit into the conceptual descriptions of Evans et al. (2013).

Page 2, line 30: How is a probabilistic description not a way to capture the error?

The referee is correct that our formulation is unclear. We will clarify it along the following: Our interest explicitly is to include the uncertainty from the dating in a statistical noise term for a pseudoproxy time-series. Therefore, we do not consider Bayesian or Monte Carlo methods but take a simple approach to develop an error term for the dating uncertainty.

Page 4, line 3: Why choose an arbitrary point on the map? Why not a place where it

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



would be possible to have a sedimentary record in the first place (ocean or lake)?

The TraCE-21ka simulation has a low grid-resolution of about 3.75 times 3.75 degree. The chosen grid-point represents a good portion of the northern Iberian peninsula including the Pyrenees, where certainly a lake core would be possible. However, the choice is in so far arbitrary as we do not try to use the location of an available core. As this is an example for visualisation's sake, we do not see why this choice is critical. As we mention, the use of a land grid-point eases the readability in comparison to, e.g., the grid-point in the supplement. We consider switching to another marine grid-point.

Page 6, line 14: I'm rather unclear about "Bias at the reconstruction level"? Aren't all sources of noise and biases important the reconstruction level? Also how can seasonality not be considered sensor uncertainty?

We will clarify this. The referee is correct, in the end everything affects the reconstruction, and indeed seasonality and habitat are sensor specific factors.

Our thinking here is that there are processes for which our possibly wrong attribution is a factor at the reconstruction stage and not at the sensor stage although the processes indeed are forward factors in the evolution of the record from the date of an environmental occurrence to our reconstruction.

Page 7, line 18: The change in noise level is not obvious at all.

We will provide more pointers what we mean and refer more clearly to Figures 1a where one can see a change from a standard deviation of approximately 1 to approximately 1.5.

Page 7, line 22: What three versions? Since it seems to be important, could you describe them?

We will clarify this. We use three different amplitudes as shown in Figure 1b and also highlighted in Figure 1d.

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

Page 17: Why use the Lomb for comparison? It is known to have a bias in the high frequencies. The WWZ transform might be a better option for unevenly-spaced datasets.

We follow Dee et al. (2017) in using the Lomb-Scargle method. The preference of the one over the other is one of convenience. We feel confident in using the Lomb-Scargle by the given reference and reconsidering the wider literature.

We test the approach described by Mathias et al. (2004), which is related to the WWZ. Results and implications are comparable between Lomb-Scargle and this approach. We are yet undecided, which approach to include in the revised manuscript.

Page 17, line 27: In pseudo proxy experiments, something needs to be used as ground truth would it be reanalysis data, instrumental data or in the case the TracCE-21ka output. I'm unclear as how these peaks are spurious rather than "the proxy didn't capture them."

We will clarify that, in our understanding, these peaks and troughs are due to the specific forcing implementation as presented for example on <http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/ccr/TraCE/>. We now write: First, peaks and troughs at some location are clearly attributable to the specific implementation of the forcing in the TraCE-21ka simulation (He, 2011; see also, Liu et al., 2009). That is, these signals are not realistic but due to technical decisions in the production of the simulations.

Page 19, last three lines: I agree that a process-based model would be more useful and they are fairly simple to implement. Hence, I don't understand how the noise approach presented here is useful.

Our understanding of reconstruction methods and of simulations benefits from multitudes of approaches. The benefit of this manuscript is not least that it provides in its assets the data. It boils the processes down to noise or bias formulations. It follows pseudoproxy approaches in the Common Era, which rely on noise. As stated above, the usefulness of a data-set or an approach often may be assessed a priori, but not

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

always.

We hope that our clarifications in the manuscript are sufficient to convince the referee that even our simplistic noise-based approach has merit. In short, we would like to stress the complementary nature of our approach to more complex set-ups and the flexibility of the noise formulations, which allow easily adapting it to changes in our understanding and thus facilitates the performance testing of different tools of paleoclimatology.

Technical corrections

I would also suggest editing the manuscript for English.

We are going to thoroughly consider our use of English.

For instance, Page 2, line 3: “as base of the comparisons”. Do you mean “as a basis for comparison”?

We are sorry for this oversight and will clarify the sentence

Page 2, line 4: “a, eg. Temperature reconstruction and the model” is clearly missing words.

We are sorry for this oversight and will repair the sentence

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Referee 2:

This study presents a generalizable approach to modeling sedimentary proxy systems and then shows how it works using the TraCE-21ka simulation. I think this is a good study that provides a flexible way to estimate various kinds of noise in proxies and that provides a nice set of pseudoproxies for potential use in a pseudo-reconstruction framework. I also think that this study can be useful for seeing how different uncertainties can affect proxy time series.

We want to thank the referee for their comments and their generous evaluation of our manuscript.

I have a number of comments, corrections, and requests for clarification below:

Abstract and elsewhere: The use of e.g. and i.e. is too frequent and would be better to just re-write with words.

We correct this in the revised version.

There are several paragraphs throughout that are just two sentences, which is a little unusual and not totally necessary, and so would be better suited to combine with surrounding paragraphs.

We reorganise the manuscript accordingly.

Introduction: Can you better situate the present study in the context of previous approaches to generating sedimentary proxy system models/pseudoproxies? What is unique about this approach? Is it more comprehensive than previous studies? Does it innovatively use the Evans et al. 2013 framework? Is it the first to be applied to the TraCE simulation or to generate pseudoproxies over this time frame? Etc.

We position our manuscript, data, and approach better in the larger context. This requires a restructuring of the introduction, therefore we do not yet include our changes

here.

p.2 I.8 The words "The review" just after citing both Smerdon 2012 and Mann and Rutherford 2002 make it unclear which paper you're referring to.

We thank the referee for spotting this. We clarify this.

p.2 I.12-17 I'm not sure this discussion of "three" different ways is quite right or at least I think I disagree with the framing of the issues here. For instance, the "proxy system model" framework of Evans et al. 2013 subsumes all of these. And so it's not as though using a proxy system model framework is a different approach from just estimating proxy error, it's that just estimating proxy error is usually considering only one of several issues that must be accounted for in the construction of pseudoproxies (i.e., only estimating the "sensor model" while potentially ignoring the "archive model" and the "observation model", using the terminology of Evans et al. 2013).

We try to clarify our framing as follows:

In our understanding there are various approaches to obtain pseudoproxies. These range from most comprehensive to most simplified. We can try to obtain a comprehensive representation from the environmental influences on a sensor to the measurement and implement this into a mechanistic forward model of the proxy system of interest. Such models can be more complex or they may concentrate on a core set of processes (compare the full and reduced implementations of the Vaganov-Shashkin approach to modelling tree-rings presented by, e.g., Evans et al. 2006, and Tolwinski-Ward et al., 2011). That is, the first approach to obtaining pseudoproxies is process based. Other, more reduced approaches potentially ignore this mechanistic process understanding and focus on stochastic expressions of the noise that influence our inferences about past climates. Such an approach can try to formulate mathematically tractable expressions for statistical noise-terms, which represent the different processes or effects influencing the stages from the original environmental influence to our final observation [Dolman et al., in preparation]. Another way of producing pseudoproxies by focusing on

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



stochastic noise expressions uses simple estimates of plausible errors. The different approaches can be very general or specific for certain proxy types. They can focus on one stage of the proxy system from environment to measurement or consider more or even all stages. Indeed, all these approaches fit into the conceptual descriptions of Evans et al. (2013).

p.3 l.13-15 It's not clear to me what this sentence means. "On top of this one could use additional stages for the environment and the final reconstruction, however, we can include the associated uncertainties in any of the three stages proposed by Evans et al." The different stages have different types of noise that are particular to the specific process under consideration.

We are not yet clear, whether to remove or to clarify these sentences. Our thinking here is: Considering the reconstruction stage, our, e.g., calibration introduces additional uncertainty, which is not a priori captured by the stages sensor, archive, measurement. We can argue to include it in the measurement stage. We can also argue that these uncertainties are de facto uncertainties resulting from processes at the sensor stage or at the archiving stage. Similarly, our understanding is that the sensor model does not commonly account for all uncertainties of the environmental influences. That is, an additional environmental stage could provide weighted data of various environmental influences. These processes, however to some extent, can also be included in the sensor model or uncertainties can be assumed to mostly affect the measurement model.

p.7 l.12-15 It's not clear to me what the bias term actually is here. You mention several different things like that it is dependent on insolation, or that it is scaled to be positive, or that it is randomized, or that it is scaled by an ad hoc constant. So what is it then? All of these at once? Only one at a time? Can you state this more clearly and/or perhaps show in mathematical terms what you mean for the different cases?—just having the term "Bias(t)" isn't exactly clear.

In this formulation, we add one time-dependent bias-term. It is calculated dependent

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

on insolation, it is positive but it could be negative or the sign could be randomized, and it is scaled by an ad-hoc constant. We will clarify this and provide the equations for the bias term.

Figure 6: I recommend putting the dates of the periods on this figure so it's more clear which figures correspond to what period (e.g., the deglaciation vs. the Holocene, which have very different correlation maps)

We will clarify this.

Figure 7: It would help the reader to briefly explain what the values imply. Logs of standard deviation ratios aren't necessarily intuitive. Also indicating the specific date ranges that you're using (as in my comment on Fig. 6) would be helpful.

We will clarify and discuss this.

For both Fig 6 7. The color map used here is usually for dry-wet data, but the figures aren't about hydroclimate at all. I would recommend using a different colormap so as to minimize any confusion.

We change the color scales.

Section 3.5 It would be helpful to write this generalized model down in mathematical terms, not just explain in words, so that readers can be sure what exactly you've done in producing Fig 8 or so that they can think about ways to adjust the generalized model.

We will provide a mathematical formulation of the generalizations.

p.21 l.11-12 This sentence isn't clear.

We clarify the sentence as follows: If we repeat the analyses in Figures 6 and 7 for the generalized approach, differences are hardly to identify.

Section 3.5.1 Can you motivate the "modifications" you're doing here? It's not obvious to me what needs modification and why. And modifications to which approach, the full

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



version or the generalized one? And what's the motivation for using the generalized approach vs. the full approach? I think you also need to say more clearly what approach the ensemble of pseudoproxies is based on and why you chose one relative to the other for that dataset. Would it be possible and useful to provide pseudoproxies for both approaches?

We clarify all these points in the revised version.

We now write: In the following we present an ensemble of pseudoproxies. At 144 locations we compute 500 pseudoproxy records each. For this, we make further slight modifications to the generalized approach. These adjustments relax our assumptions and result in larger differences between members of the ensemble than would be possible without the modifications. [...] Using the generalized approach provides an ensemble based on the most reduced formulation. [...] As mentioned above, these changes relax our assumptions on the effect of changes in the background climate.

Indeed, it would be also of value to provide pseudoproxy ensembles for both the full approach as well as the un-modified generalizations. We will consider to provide two or even three ensembles in preparing the revised manuscript.

p.21 I.14 Why are there 500 pseudoproxies at 144 locations? And are there 500 total or 500 for each of the 144 locations (and thus $n = 500 \cdot 144$ pseudoproxies)?

We clarify this now in the text.

Indeed, there is an ensemble of 500 pseudoproxies at the 144 locations. We chose the 144 locations as the unique locations after screening proxy locations.

Fig 10. The blue lines are hard to see here.

We will clarify the Figure.

p.23 I.24-25 I'd recommend un-gendering this line using "their"

We thank the referee for spotting this extremely embarrassing mistake, and want to

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



apologize for it. We change this.

ESSDD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Referee 3:

SUMMARY

Bothe, Wagner and Zorita present code to produce sediment pseudo-proxy time series, i.e. a time series of a temperature variable that originates from transient climate model output and that has been modified in several stages mimicking - statistically - the processes that affect sedimentary palaeoclimate archives.

This is a timely and relevant approach and could prove useful for model data comparison in the near future with more transient paleoclimate model simulations becoming available.

We want to thank the referee for their comments and their generous evaluation of our manuscript.

GENERAL COMMENTS

- unclear aims: which properties of the data will be compared? The present formulation only allows time-mean comparisons.

We are unclear about the direction of these questions.

We will try to clarify the purpose of our pseudoproxy data.

The provided data and the code allow for the generation of pseudoproxy records for any simulation. These can be continuous or temporally sparse and regularly or irregularly sampled. The provided data particularly allows the comparison of different models against another over time, as well as testing methods for the comparison of simulation and proxy data over time. The irregular sampling however hampers the comparison of time-slices.

As said, we are unclear about the direction of this question/comment.

- downloading and testing the data generation is cumbersome as all parts apparently have to be manually downloaded. It would help to have a provided zip file, and a README on how to get started.

We will provide one or more zip-files collecting the different types of data provided. A short documentation will clarify how to best approach data and code-examples.

DETAILED COMMENTS

- p1 l4/following: the term "pseudoproxies" suggests that it is possible to hand the code a description of a specific sediment record (including e.g. information on the number/precision/type of dating) and all ensuing uncertainties are considered. This is not the case here, as all terms of non-climatic/insolation uncertainty considered remain statistical and non-proxy/archive specific.

We understand and respect the referee's point but after reconsidering the term and its use in the literature, we disagree. The term pseudoproxy does not refer to a surrogate for a specific record. In the literature, pseudoproxy, surrogate proxy, and pseudoproxy experiments are phrases, which refer to modifications of observational data, reanalysis data, or simulation output. The applications of such modifications are not limited to either real world proxy records or real world proxy types. Such modifications in the broad sense of pseudoproxies are simply stand-ins for real world data in research enterprises of interest.

The revised manuscript explains our view of the term pseudoproxy. We add in the introduction the following: We clarify here our use of the term pseudoproxy. We follow the literature since Mann and Rutherford (2002). That is, a pseudoproxy simply represents a modification of observational data, reanalysis data, or simulation output. It replaces real world proxies in a certain application. The term may but does not nec-

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

essarily refer to stand-ins for specific proxy records or particular proxy types. That is, the term pseudoproxy does not by itself imply that the modifications of the input data represent validly the uncertainties or characteristics of real world data. This view of the term pseudoproxy is in line with the past literature (compare, for example, Mann and Rutherford, 2002; Osborn and Briffa, 2004; von Storch et al., 2004; Jones et al., 2009; Graham and Wahl, 2011; Thompson et al., 2011; Lehner et al., 2012; Smerdon, 2012; Hind et al., 2012; Annan and Hargreaves, 2013; Kurahashi-Nakamura et al., 2014; Steiger and Hakim, 2016). These modifications may be simply by adding noise to the input data or may invoke more complex forward approaches (for example mechanistic Proxy System Models, Evans et al., 2013, see below).

-p2 I26-31: Considering dating uncertainty as purely additive white noise independent of the time axis strongly limits the suitability of the resulting time series. Autocorrelation results from the distortion of the time axis by changes in accumulation rate - which should, in a real proxy record, be captured by dating, and subsequent age modelling. Dating uncertainty represents a large component of the overall contribution to the low signal to noise ratio (c.f. Reschke, Rehfeld Laepple, Clim. Past. Discuss). The net cross-ensemble mean of the dating contribution to the final pseudoproxy uncertainty is zero in the presented formulation, as is the serial correlation of the component. Both is not appropriate. It would be beneficial to adopt (or include/prepare for) ensemble-based age models for the actual underlying proxy records; or if a simplistic solution is desired, to include the more realistic option of modeling age uncertainty by relative squeezing and stretching of the time axis.

We appreciate the referee's concerns. There are various points here. We disagree on the suitability of the resulting time-series. We are still confident that the time-series including the error terms are suitable for wide range of applications in, e.g., comparing different model simulations, model-data evaluation, and testing of reconstruction methods. The dating uncertainty in our set-up has two parts, the sampling of the dates and the sampling of the dating uncertainty on the one hand, and the associated dating error

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

modelling on the other hand.

Indeed, not all our implementations of the dating error showed serial correlation so far, however, most and particularly the main approach led to a small amount of serial correlation by making the dating uncertainty error dependent on previous errors and “measurements”.

We will modify our code to allow for larger uncertainty and correlation in the final products. The specific implementation is still work in progress, but modifications are possible for the sampling of the dates, the date uncertainties, or the correlation between modelled errors. However, if tests of this new approach fail to show an added value we are going to fall back to the current version for our data but the modifications will be kept in the code. As mentioned above, we still regard the full set of pseudoproxies of immediate value for a number of tasks.

Thus, indeed, we choose to concentrate on a simplistic approach.

- p 3 l30 and following: Why is only summer seasonality considered? Is this a limitation of the pseudoproxy code?

We concentrate on the modern boreal summer season for convenience sake and not least since many authors attribute the sensitivity of their proxies to the summer season. We could have similarly used annual data or any other seasonal definition. The pseudoproxy code takes a time-series of any seasonality of interest. At this stage, it does not read the full annual matrix. We will consider within the preparation of revisions to formulate the code more flexibly.

- p4 l3: why this gridpoint? The arbitrariness of this choice somewhat illustrates that it appears difficult to use this code to include knowledge on real-life proxy datasets (e.g. sedimentation rate/dating frequency/ multi-proxy configurations).

As the referee already notes, this decision was generally arbitrary. It was made in relation to comparison with various proxies around the Iberian Peninsula and more

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

generally Europe in another context. As we describe, the visualisation for another proxy is provided in the Supplementary materials. As we state above, the aim here is not to test real world proxies but to provide data for testing methods and code to evaluate models and data. We consider changing the grid point. However, we want to stress that our approach does not aim at mimicking real proxies but at providing pseudoproxies also for locations where we do not have real world knowledge.

- Sec. 3: Please provide a graphical illustration of your pseudoproxy generation (e.g. using a graphical model).

We will provide a visualisation of the procedure but plan to put it only in a supplement or appendix.

- p6 I26: Autocorrelation should be considered, as several of the noise components (dating, non-local climate) are expected to be autocorrelated processes. The difficulty will be in actually estimating the true autocorrelation that should be used for the noise process.

As we note, the code provided allows for generating autocorrelated noise. We now change various components to correlated models.

- p7 I6: Is the assumption of increasing noise variability with increasing parameter variability appropriate for all noise components? It would appear that larger climatic variations might be recorded more precisely. In the absence of information whether proxy noise is smaller or larger for higher or lower climate variability this term should be reconsidered.

We will introduce a random switch.

While larger variations may be recorded more precisely one may also assume that larger, e.g., temperature variations are associated with larger variations in other environmental components that may result in larger errors.

- p7 I22: Can winter insolation be considered as bias?

If we understand the referees question correctly, then, yes, there is no reason why one should not consider winter insolation.

For now it is not implemented directly but we consider to change this in the revisions.

- p8 l5 and following: How do the processes and results here compare to the approach by Dolman and Laepple (2018)?

Our assumptions simplify the more complex approach of Dolman and Laepple. Our randomization could be seen as more realistic while the lack of process based assumptions make our approach less realistic.

Generally our results are not as smooth as the results of Dolman and Laepple considering the bioturbation while the assumptions on the subsampling appear to be comparable in our reading.

- p10 l13: typo original

We want to thank the referee for spotting this. We change this in the revised version.

- p10 and following: The measurement error will depend on the type of sampling. To which degree is the sampling of the pseudo-proxy archive consecutive, overlapping, or spot-wise?

In this implementation, we only consider a conceptual measurement error and sample the time-series at certain years in the time-series as stated in the text. We will clarify this in the text.

- p13 l12: Consider also the Bayesian Age-Depth modeling methods (e.g. OxCal, Bacon etc) which provide probability density functions of the proxy records.

We aim to include a brief note on age-depth modelling methods.

- Figure 5: Please provide ensemble averages that allow to assess the spectral biases due to the proxy processes more easily.

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

We, at this point, do not use ensembles but only the single estimate. We will consider clarifying this Figure and its description in line with the comment of referee 1 on the Lomb-Scargle periodogram.

- Figure 10: The time series are difficult to process and compare by eye. It appears in some cases there is an amplification of the apparent signal in the pseudoproxy record. Why? Where on the globe is the SD of the pseudoproxy > the SD of the climate signal?

This is mainly due to the size of the considered bias and the amplitude of noise processes. We will provide a visualisation equivalent to Figure 7 to answer the latter question.

- p28: missing section ref.

We want to thank the referee for spotting this. We change this in the revised version.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2018-137>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

