

***Interactive comment on* “Towards an improvement of OSL age uncertainties: modelling OSL ages with systematic errors, stratigraphic constraints and radiocarbon ages using the R package “BayLum”” by Guillaume Guérin et al.**

Andrew Millard (Referee)

a.r.millard@durham.ac.uk

Received and published: 5 January 2021

General comments

This paper gives an overall description of the BayLum package which runs in the R statistical computing environment. In general it is clear and only minor changes are needed for publication.

The paper gives a thorough description of the models developed which form a holistic approach to the uncertainties in OSL dating, though it is yet to be seen how well the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



input routines will adapt to the slightly differing approaches of different laboratories. The error terms for the various measurements and constants that contribute to the calculation of an OSL date are comprehensively considered and each is handled in an appropriate fashion

Specific and technical comments

I have only one correction that needs to be made. The authors often use the frequentist term confidence interval or its abbreviation CI when they should be using the Bayesian term credible interval. The only place that confidence interval is appropriate is in referring to the Gelman-Rubin statistic. Elsewhere it is not appropriate, for example, Line 195, Figure 1, and in Table 1 the caption says credible intervals (correct) but the header row uses confidence intervals (wrong).

I have run all the code provided in the R markdown file, and confirm that it produces the expected results, except at two points:

In the Rmd file the scatterplots generated at lines 254 and 260 in Example 2 do not appear to be truncated as in Figures 4 and 5. I think this is because they use A\$Sampling rather than A1\$Sampling.

Fer 2 has 95% credible interval of 36-46 ka (manuscript line 526) but the markdown output (from line 423) gives 31-39 ka.

Interactive comment on Geochronology Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gchron-2020-40>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

