

## Reply to McIntyre and McKittrick: Proxy-based temperature reconstructions are robust

McIntyre and McKittrick (1) raise no valid issues regarding our paper. We specifically discussed divergence of “composite plus scale” (CPS) and “error-in-variables” (EIV) reconstructions before A.D. 1000 [ref. 2 and supporting information (SI) therein] and demonstrated (in the SI) that the EIV reconstruction is the more reliable where they diverge. The method of uncertainty estimation (use of calibration/validation residuals) is conventional (3, 4) and was described explicitly in ref. 2 (also in ref. 5), and Matlab code is available at [www.meteo.psu.edu/~mann/supplements/MultiproxyMeans07/code/codeveri/calc\\_error.m](http://www.meteo.psu.edu/~mann/supplements/MultiproxyMeans07/code/codeveri/calc_error.m).

McIntyre and McKittrick’s claim that the common procedure (6) of screening proxy data (used in some of our reconstructions) generates “hockey sticks” is unsupported in peer-reviewed literature and reflects an unfamiliarity with the concept of screening regression/validation.

As clearly explained in ref. 2, proxies incorporating instrumental information were eliminated for validation and thus did not enter into skill assessment.

The claim that “upside down” data were used is bizarre. Multivariate regression methods are insensitive to the sign of predictors. Screening, when used, employed one-sided tests

only when a definite sign could be a priori reasoned on physical grounds. Potential nonclimatic influences on the Tiljander and other proxies were discussed in the SI, which showed that none of our central conclusions relied on their use.

Finally, McIntyre and McKittrick misrepresent both the National Research Council report and the issues in that report that we claimed to address (see abstract in ref. 2). They ignore subsequent findings (4) concerning “strip bark” records and fail to note that we required significance of both reduction of error and coefficient of efficiency statistics relative to a standard red noise hypothesis to define a skillful reconstruction. In summary, their criticisms have no merit.

**Michael E. Mann<sup>1</sup>, Raymond S. Bradley, and Malcolm K. Hughes**  
*Pennsylvania State University, Walker Building, University Park, PA 16802*

1. McIntyre S, McKittrick R (2009) Proxy inconsistency and other problems in millennial paleoclimate reconstructions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 106:E10.
2. Mann ME, et al. (2008) Proxy-based reconstructions of hemispheric and global surface temperature variations over the past two millennia. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 105:13252–13257.
3. Luterbacher J, Dietrich D, Xoplaki E, Grosjean M, Wanner H (2004) European seasonal and annual temperature variability, trends, and extremes since 1500. *Science* 303:1499–1503.
4. Wahl ER, Ammann CM (2007) Robustness of the Mann, Bradley, Hughes reconstruction of surface temperatures: Examination of criticisms based on the nature and processing of proxy climate evidence. *Clim Change* 85:33–69.
5. Mann ME, Rutherford S, Wahl E, Ammann C (2007) Robustness of proxy-based climate field reconstruction methods. *J Geophys Res* 112:D12109.
6. Osborn TJ, Briffa KR (2006) The spatial extent of 20th-century warmth in the context of the past 1200 years. *Science* 311:841–844.

Author contributions: M.E.M., R.S.B., and M.K.H. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

<sup>1</sup>To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: [mann@psu.edu](mailto:mann@psu.edu).

© 2009 by The National Academy of Sciences of the USA