

## ***Interactive comment on “Applicability of ensemble pattern scaling method on precipitation intensity indices at regional scale” by Y. Li and W. Ye***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 14 July 2011

General Comments This research uses climate model projections to study changes in future precipitation intensity indices in Australia. The results are relevant to regional climate change impacts in Australia, and the methodology could be transferable to other regions in the world. However, I have two general problems with the paper in its current format. Firstly, the results (section 3) need to be made more concise. In its current form it is difficult to extract the most relevant and noteworthy pieces of information. In fact the whole paper could be edited to make it clearer. Secondly the clarity of the English in the paper needs to be addressed (see specific and technical corrections below).

Specific and technical comments

P5228, lines 2-4: This opening sentence is not grammatically correct. Rephrase and

C2798

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



define a GCM.

P5228, lines 9-11/15-17: Rephrase the English. Also, I think for numbers under 10 the number should be written out (e.g. 3 should be three). This occurs throughout the paper.

P5229, lines 2-7/21-23: Rephrase. These sentences are too long, and are thus difficult to understand.

P5230, lines 15-16: What does “in proportion with the global warming trend” mean? I think you need to elaborate on this point.

P5230, line 22: Rephrase - incorrect English.

P5232. Add a table describing the 12 models and their characteristics (i.e. grid resolution, institution that built them).

P5232, lines 10-12: What does “GCM-internal ensemble” mean? Please define this concept.

P5232, line 14: define GHG.

P5232, lines 18-19: It may be best to rephrase “randomness...” and say about the non-linearity (chaotic nature) of the climate system.

P5233, line 8: Are there 72 ensemble members? If so please say so to make it is easier for the reader (e.g.  $N=72$ ).

P5233, line 15/19-20: This needs more explanation. I have always been told that an ensemble average is better (than the median) because an average takes into account all the information in the ensemble. Also, give some details on the bootstrapping and L-moments method that you have applied (not just referencing other authors).

P5234, lines 21-23: Rephrase, as it is confusing in its current format.

P5236, line 12: It is not possible to tell what models refer to what numbers in Figure

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



2. I know that you have mentioned the models (and numbers) in the text, but a table would make it much easier to interpret these results instead of trying to find the model numbers in the methods section (see comment above).

P5237, lines 6-7: “significant” should be “significance”.

P5239, line 23: Remind readers what the three precipitation indices are for ease of reading.

P5240, line 3: “ECHAM\_MPI” is not the name format of this model in Table 4.

P5241, line 2: “quantified” would be a better word than “analysed”.

P5241, lines 18-20: Have you got a reason for this result?

P5241: “SD” is used earlier in the manuscript, so please define it when it first appears.

P5242, line 18: “prediction” should be “projection”.

P5242, line 21: What are the “certain effects”?

P5242-43: Be careful not to dismiss the results of your work. By saying that the small sample size was insufficient, you are saying that your results are not good. I would recommend rephrasing. (The same applies to lines 1-9 on P5244).

P5244, line 24: “good compromised method”. It is unclear what you mean here. Please rephrase.

P5245, line 23: Should “10th and 90th” be followed by percentile?

P5245, line 27: It would be best to say “the two other extreme precipitation indices”.

P5245, lines 28-29: Parts of this sentence needs to be rephrased. Also, I am not sure that this does show the random nature of precipitation. Perhaps, the GCMs just can’t resolve extreme precipitation?

Tables: In the text you have generally used “significance level”, but in the tables you

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



have used “confidence level”. It would best to be consistent in the manuscript. Also, somewhere in the text the Australian Territories should be defined, as not everyone will know what NSW, NT, QLD etc means.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 5227, 2011.

**HESD**

8, C2798–C2801, 2011

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C2801

