

## ***Interactive comment on “Past, present and future biomes in Beringia: Comparison between simulations and pollen analysis” by Kazuyuki Saito et al.***

**I. Barr**

i.barr@mmu.ac.uk

Received and published: 23 April 2018

This manuscript covers interesting topic, though there is scope for a much more specific focus (at present the manuscript tries to do a lot – by looking at past, present and future, but does not say all that much. A clearer focus on the past, might result in a better manuscript).

Areas that (I suggest) need to be addressed: General issues: 1. The manuscript clearly focuses on Beringia (as outlined in the title and elsewhere), but there is repeated mention of the ‘Arctic’. In fact, the entire introduction is focused on the Arctic. However, the authors clearly state (pg. 4., line 5) that the southern limit of the study area is 50°N

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



– this is a long way from the Arctic. I would argue that the entire introduction needs re-focusing on Beringia, and would suggest very little mention of the Arctic. Even the Conclusions starts with ‘Arctic’, despite the real focus on Beringia. 2. The introduction is very East Beringia focused. This is partly reflecting in Fig. 1., which shows an out-dated view of LGM ice extent in East Siberia. There is also limited mention of data from Elgygytgyn Lake – one of the best archives for Quaternary environmental change anywhere on Earth. 3. The introduction is quite general in places. I suggest that it needs to be re-written with a clear focus on this manuscript (I suspect much of this material comes directly from the thesis upon which the paper is based). 4. Section 3.2. (Historical and Future Simulations) seems like an ‘add-on’. I’m not sure this adds anything to the study.

Specific issues: 1. I suggest that all citations (within parentheses) be listed in chronological order. 2. I am not sure that information about when websites were accessed is needed for the in-text citations (this information can be provided in the reference list). 3. ‘Earth’ should have a capital ‘e’. 4. ‘thousands’ is perhaps better presented numerically (e.g., ‘126 ka’ or ‘126,000 years ago’, rather than ‘126 thousand years ago’). 5. Section 1.2.1. needs to include additional citations to relevant publications from West Beringia. 6. Pg. 4., line 12: Full-stop (period) needed after ‘2008’. 7. Pg. 7., line 26: Parentheses without content – i.e., (). 8. Pg. 7., line 32: ‘skilful’ seems like strange wording. Consider replacing. 9. Pg. 9., line 4: delete ‘(yet)’. If we are going to use such terminology, then ‘yet’ could be applied to all lacking data (i.e., it would be used throughout most publications). 10. Pg 12, line 16. Replace the word ‘thesis’. Here, I suspect, is the nub. Thought this work originates from a student thesis, there is a need for greater care/effort in converting it to a publishable manuscript.

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2018-29>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

