

TREE-RING RESEARCH (formerly Tree-Ring Bulletin)
Publication of the Tree-Ring Society

Manuscript: Evaluation of the Irish oak chronology and its linkage (research report)
P.O. Larsson & L.-A Larsson

COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR(S)

1. Originality of the work

The content of this research report and the underlying data in 2012 have been published by the authors at

<http://www.cybis.se/forfun/dendro>. Regretfully this means that I cannot consider the current manuscript as an original (i.e. previously unpublished) work.

It is unclear from the manuscript whether or not the author(s) of the data have granted permission for their data to be published in the current form. The manuscript should provide clarity in this respect (e.g. in the Acknowledgements).



The Research Report will gain significance and impact if dendrochronologists who developed the data and interpretations initially are included as co-authors in as far as they are available.

2. Importance and interest to the Tree-Ring Research's readers

In its current form the report offers no new information since all content (and more) already is available through the above-mentioned website.

The authors regretfully have not previously published about dendrochronology in academic journals or books. My advice is that they involve coauthors with a proven track record in this field.

3. Scientific soundness of the methods, arguments and interpretations

The report contains insufficient information to allow for a step-by-step replication of the research. More specifically: it lacks exact references to datasets and related publications, does not give references for the statistical variables used for cross dating, and presents dendrochronological matches (e.g., lines 39-40) without giving cross-dating statistics and visual information (tables, graphs). The authors refer to their website for such details, however this is not a peer-reviewed medium and therefore cannot be used as addendum to a publication in Tree-Ring Research..

4. Degree to which conclusions are supported by the data

The degree to which conclusions are supported by the data cannot be assessed from the report, since this contains too little information and is mostly descriptive. Further checking of data and results is not part of this review, since it would entail reviewing the 'dendro for fun' website which is not part of Tree-Ring Research.

5. Organization and clarity of the text and data presentation

See 3 and 4.

6. Length relative to the number of new ideas and information

The topic is too large to be fully described in a Research Report. A full paper would be more suitable.

7. Conciseness and writing style

The abstract in its current form contains too little information. It should shortly present the research question, data sets, methodology and findings.

Keywords should be added between Abstract and Introduction.

Exclamation marks should be removed (lines 70 and 86).