Climate of the Past Discussions

Clim. Past Discuss., author comment AC1
https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2021-96-AC1, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Reply on RC1

Peihong Jin et al.

Author comment on "Multiple Proxy Estimates of pCO_2 in the Hauterivian–Barremian of the Laiyang Basin, Eastern China" by Peihong Jin et al., Clim. Past Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2021-96-AC1, 2021

We appreciate your comment and suggestion and your opinion is to the point. We have learned much from these, and we will revise all of these mistakes in the manuscript.

- the age of each stratigraphic level and the new data in Fig.6.

We will explain the age of each stratigraphic in more detail in the later revision. In addition, in order to make the discussion more complete, we will use the mechanistic model to estimate the pCO_2 values for the Early Cretaceous and add more data in Fig.6 based on the previously reported stomata data of Cheirolepidiaceae species.

- the estimates of Retallack 2001 used in Fig. 6.

We have corrected these errors in Fig. 6, Table 6, and corresponding positions in the manuscript.

- l.470 We will revise the expression here in the later revision
- l.84 Because the Cretaceous strata from this basin are well-developed, continuously exposed and complete and contain abundant and various fossil categories. The expression of sentence is not clear, and we will rephrase it in the later revision.
- l.148 It means penultimate or antipenultimate.
- l.307 We are so sorry for this mistake. It was Vienna Pee Dee belemnite standard.