

Clim. Past Discuss., community comment CC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2021-170-CC1>, 2022  
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Comment on cp-2021-170

Irina Kurina

---

Community comment on "The 852/3 CE Mount Churchill eruption: examining the potential climatic and societal impacts and the timing of the Medieval Climate Anomaly in the North Atlantic region" by Helen Mackay et al., Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2021-170-CC1>, 2022

---

I read with great pleasure the manuscript "The 852/3 CE Mount Churchill eruption: examining the potential climatic and societal impacts and the timing of the Medieval Climate Anomaly in the North Atlantic Region" by Helen Mackay and co-authors. I think the journal Climate of the Past is the it home for this manuscript. I found this work to be meaningful and comprehensive research, including many details, although each detail seems to be necessary and does not overburden the investigation. To my mind, the manuscript represents a synthesis of diverse facts from different fields of science, which focus on the 852/3 CE eruption event and taking together help to sort out the influence of this event on palaeoenvironment and social life of mankind. In reality, this is a very difficult task to follow (reconstruct) the impact of a single volcanic eruption on the environment using a series of diverse palaeoecological records (peat, lake sediments, ice and so on) accompanied with surviving historical documents. I think this research is a good example of testing the potential of complex paleoenvironmental reconstructions to date. It's not our fault that we can't reconstruct every detail we would like to do. The research is well organized, including a good selection of literature sources. Conclusions are plausible and discreet. I believe this manuscript deserves to be published without changes in this journal. It is actual and attractive. I only found a few misprints across the text of the manuscript and I propose to correct them. See below:

Line 8 – Pete G. Langdon. I think it is Peter (not Pete).

Line 106 – Sigl et al. 2015 – the comma is missing; Fig 2 – the point is missing.

Line 219 – (Fig. d-e) – the number of Fig. is missing. I think this is 1.

Line 258 – (Newfield 2013, Devroey 2019) – two commas are missing and one comma instead of semicolon.

Line 572 – (Fig 3b) – the point is missing.