

Interactive comment on “The 4.2 ka BP Event in the Mediterranean Region: an overview” by Monica Bini et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 20 November 2018

The manuscript presented by the authors seems to me of great relevance, because of the paleoenvironmental and archaeological interest of the subject and the discourse and arguments that they develop. Honestly, I consider the title chosen by the authors in their paper of great honesty, since they do not try to make us suppose that it is a synthesis of the issue but simply a summary or overview. My most sincere congratulations to the authors for this magnificent contribution. It is true, however, that I miss some kind of archaeological implication of the data presented in this manuscript; although I also understand that it is not your goal, but it would have been a great contribution.

The manuscript hosts a very adequate and convincing speech, its organization is perfect and the volume of data handled is impressive. The results and discussion are wonderful and very well done. Once again, my most sincere congratulations to the

C1

authors.

Suggestions and minor corrections: + Page 2 Line 25. Include these two references: Blanco-González, A., Lillios, K.T., López-Sáez, J.A. & Drake, B.L. (2018). Cultural, demographic and environmental dynamics of the Copper and Early Bronze Age in Iberia (3300-1500 BC): towards an interregional multiproxy comparison at the time of the 4.2 ky BP event. *Journal of World Prehistory*, 31: 1-79. Lillios, K.T., Blanco González, A., Drake, B.L. & López-Sáez, J.A. (2016). Mid-Late Holocene climate, demography, and cultural dynamics in Iberia: a multi-proxy approach. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 135: 138-153. + Page 3 Line 12. The authors are right in their statements. However, I believe that they could be much more precise in explaining the chosen records. For instance, on line 18 they themselves speak of “optimal” conditions. What are these conditions? The authors should make this issue clear since it is probably the most important in all its argumentation. + It is evident, and quite logical, that the authors have made a very detailed selection of the records used and discussed in this paper. However, after reading the methods section several times, I still do not have clear concepts and reasons for such choice. For example, only 5 records have been selected in the Iberian Peninsula, and none of them correspond to pollen studies. Why? In Iberian territory there are numerous pollen records at high resolution that could yield information of great value to treat the 4.2 ka cal BP event. I understand perfectly that it is impossible to use all the available information and that authors have to select conveniently; but at least, the authors should provide a convincing explanation of the choice of records. In reference to the previous point, a very great possibility that the authors could have used, would have been to select those records that have several proxies, for example, pollen and ostracods / oxygen isotopes. This could have been the case, and I am speaking by heart, of some of the records cited in Table 1, such as Prespa, Ohrid, Medina Lagoon, Tigalmamine, Sidi-Ali, Lac Petit, etc. I do not understand why there are several proxies for these records, the authors, as indicated in Table 1, have only taken into account one for each record. The discussion is sincerely incredible, very good in its speech and ar-

C2

gumentation. Points 3.1 to 3.5 combine all the results with sufficiency and clairvoyance.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.clim-past-discuss.net/cp-2018-147/cp-2018-147-RC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-147>, 2018.