

# ***Interactive comment on “The Analogue Method for Precipitation Forecasting: Finding Better Analogue Situations at a Sub-Daily Time Step” by P. Horton et al.***

**J. Seibert (Editor)**

jan.seibert@geo.uzh.ch

Received and published: 12 September 2016

While all three reviewers appreciate the value of the study they also express important concerns regarding the manuscript:

- 1) The structure needs to be improved. As it is now the intro includes a lot of the methods and in the section results&discussion there is a mix of methods, results and discussion. Please clearly separate these parts
- 2) Overall the manuscript would benefit from a language check. As partly noted by the reviewers there are quite same language issues. On point is the use of the tenses, which is rather inconsistent. Please use past tense for describing your study and present

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



tense for established knowledge (previous studies) (note, this is opposite to the recommendation of one of the reviewers, but is the more common use of tenses in scientific papers)

3) Previous work needs to be better referred to.

4) Extreme events are challenging for the AM. This should be better discussed.

5) The importance for hydrological applications could be better clarified

Best regards, Jan Seibert

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-246, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

