

# ***Interactive comment on “Episodic Neoglacial expansion and rapid 20th Century retreat of a small ice cap on Baffin Island, Arctic Canada and modeled temperature change” by Simon L. Pendleton et al.***

**P. Francus (Editor)**

pierre.francus@ete.inrs.ca

Received and published: 24 June 2017

Dear Authors,

Despite many efforts to obtain a comment from a third reviewer, an expert in glacier modeling, I have not received any. Waiting longer is not reasonable, and I do not want to delay further the decision. I looked at your responses to both reviewers and the Data Review team comments, and feel that you are in a good position to address most concerns raised in their comments. Therefore, I'm inviting you to submit a revised

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



manuscript.

Both reviewers were suggesting moving the glacier modeling part entirely to main body of the paper. I think you should only move some of the modeling material to the main body, but not everything. This part should include a discussion of the limitations of the model that were discussed in your replies to both reviewers. I also agree that the paper should include a regional synthesis and/or comparisons to other records in the Arctic. The Special Issue is indeed on the last 2k, but it also meant to be dedicated to regional syntheses. Figure 3 was also much commented by reviewers and the Data review team. I suggest you include an age/distance plot as supplemental information, and to greatly clarify what the second axis means (as you suggested in your reply). Moreover, this second plot has been built on previously published data, and we would like to make sure that the input data that were used to create the figure (not the output that's plotted in the figure) would be archived in a data repository prior to final publication. Please add a small table in section 5.3 as suggested in your reply to reviewer 1. Figure 1 could be improved by increasing the size of all panels. Panel C is not clear at all, and might be removed. Figure 2 looks good to me.

While you already discussed how you can address the comments of the reviewers, please make sure to outline in detail how and where these comments have been addressed in your revised version.

I'm looking forward to reading the revised version of your manuscript.

Best Regards

Pierre Francus

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2017-27>, 2017.

CPD

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

