

Interactive comment on “How different sources of climate databases influence assessment of growth response in dendroclimatic analyses – case study from Lapland” by R. Sitko et al.

R. Sitko et al.

vido@tuzvo.sk

Received and published: 12 November 2015

Thank you for your comment, which help us to cure so called “author’s blindness” (see something what is not written). Your comment to unclearness of some methodological points corresponds with concrete comment of Referee 1 concerning to missing explanation of reference data, may be you see the same lack of paper. We improved it in the methodological part of manuscript (see Reply to general commends for Referee 1) as well as in results (Suplement: Tab. 2, Tab. 3).

Regarding to using CRU data we used the nearest point to locality of wooden core extraction (Haras). It corresponds to the main aim of our study to compare existing cli-

C791

mate databases (not to modify them or create new one). Interpolation of CRU climate data is interesting idea, but it seems to be more complex problem. The question is how is reasonable to downscale gridded (CRU) data, which are in itself interpolated? Which interpolation method is sufficient to do this (IDW, splines, geostatistical methods of regionalization)? Would it brings significant improvement, if there are no significant differences between existing gridded databases? Those all are very challenging questions which would be interesting to resolve, but we suppose it is field for specific paper.

Anyway thanks for this idea.

Authors

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.earth-syst-dynam-discuss.net/6/C791/2015/esdd-6-C791-2015-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., 6, 1535, 2015.