

From: Phil Jones <p.jones@uea.ac.uk>
 To: "Michael E. Mann" <mann@multiproxy.evsc.virginia.edu>, "Folland, Chris" <ckfolland@meto.gov.uk>, Keith Briffa <k.briffa@uea.ac.uk>, "Folland, Chris" <ckfolland@meto.gov.uk>
 Subject: RE: IPCC revisions
 Date: Thu, 23 Sep 1999 17:20:56 +0100
 Cc: tkarl@ncdc.noaa.gov

Mike,

Here are my thoughts on the text you sent. Keith will be sending some as well hopefully later today. One important aspect Keith will address is whether you're using the latest Briffa et al curve. We know you're not but the one with the greater low frequency and therefore much better chance of looking much better with the other two series, isn't yet published. We know it looks better in plots we have here.

Specifics :

p1 line 10 - say mid-19th century rather than the 20th century

lines 18-20 - seems a bit too much here with three refs on laminated sediments.

line 46 Add Briffa et al (1998b) to Cook(1995).

p2 line 59 - I would suggest changing 'a particularly' to 'the most' .

line 64 - I would add a reference here to the paper by Crowley and Kim (1999) in GRL (July) where this aspect is also discussed.

p3 line 101 - I would add Argentina as well as Chile adding a ref to Villalba (1990) in QR.

line 108 change 'key' to 'vital'

line 119 'have providing' to 'provide' . There are several instances where the text doesn't read that well. I suspect as there are several iterations to go it is not that important yet !

The coral section is just about the right size now and is justly devoid of references !

p4 line 151 I would add a reference here to Morgan and van Ommen (1997) 'Seasonality in late-Holocene climate from ice core records', The Holocene 7, 351-4. This is the Law Dome core which is the best available with regards to dating in either hemisphere. It should be there.

As with the coral section the ice core section expresses some cautionary notes with regard to dating etc which I think are justified. I suspect the contrast with the tree-ring section will draw some criticism. Just a warning !

As none of the multiproxy reconstructions use any sediment information this section seems overlarge and could be reduced.

p189 century-scale add in the 'y'

p5 The borehole section is also a bit overlong. I don't know whether the map really adds something. Not that vehement on this.

With respect to comparing high and low frequency aspects the diagram comparing CET with the UK boreholes is now out. I've sent a copy to Chris. It is in :

Jones PD, 1999 : Classics in physical geography revisited - Manley's CET series. Progress in Physical Geography 23, 425-428.

line 245 the 'is' is not needed.

p6 I still think that a reference to Raper et al (1996) would be good here. This models a glacier in northern Sweden using the northern Fennoscandian temperature reconstructions since AD 500. Again it shows how a low frequency estimate (the glacial snout position) can be compared with a high-frequency temperature reconstruction from trees.

Raper, SCB, Briffa KR and Wigley TML, 1996: Glacial change in northern Sweden from AD 500: a simple geometric model of Storglaciaren. Journal of Glaciology 42, 341-351.

line 268 IPCC(1996) earlier - is it 95 or 96

p 7 line 295 I would like to add my paper in Reviews of Geophysics in 1999 as that also says that 1998 was likely to be the warmest year of the millennium.

line 334 I would like to see Bradley (1999). I must get a copy from Ray in Venice.

p7-9 All need a careful read through for English and the arguments.

At the bottom of p8 I think you make too much of the differences in the ranking of the centuries. The boreholes would agree with my series with the 17th being colder than the 19th, although they may not be able to resolve the timescales then.

Is the Crowley and Lowery (1999) the paper Tom's submitted to Ambio ?

I've not commented much on this final section as again I suspect there are many things you will have to justify in the next two sets of reviews. On the whole I think most is OK and I support the final paragraph. I don't believe the astronomical argument as an explanation over the last 1000 years but we can differ on that.

I know I would have written this final section 2.3.3 somewhat differently with different emphases and slants but the basic final conclusion would have been the same.

Cheers
Phil

Prof. Phil Jones
Climatic Research Unit Telephone +44 (0) 1603 592090
School of Environmental Sciences Fax +44 (0) 1603 507784
University of East Anglia
Norwich Email p.jones@uea.ac.uk
NR4 7TJ
UK
