

Interactive comment on “Spatiotemporal Patterns and Trends of Precipitation and Their Correlations with Related Meteorological Factors by Two Sets of Reanalysis Data in China” by Jinhui Jeanne Huang et al.

J. Hanesiak (Editor)

john.hanesiak@umanitoba.ca

Received and published: 28 February 2018

The editor has received two thoughtful reviews of your article titled “Spatiotemporal Patterns and Trends of Precipitation and Their Correlations with Related Meteorological Factors by Two Sets of Reanalysis Data in China”. Both reviewers suggest acceptance but with major revisions.

Some of the major comments include:

Reviewer #1 (R1):

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



The basic premise of the paper is not particularly strong because the Data and Methodology sections were not well-written and there was no insightful discussions on the implication of the findings to the hydrology community. Three specific major comments are:

- 1) Justification of correlating reanalysis variables that were derived from the same reanalysis system (see R1 specific comment)
- 2) Justification of using the two reanalysis datasets that were chosen for the study (both reviewers commented on this). Please explain why these two datasets were chosen over others and if they are better than others over China. Please see the specific comment from R1.
- 3) Three issues with respect to references throughout the manuscript. See specific comment from R1.

Reviewer #2 (R2)

- 1) Explanation of why the three major China sub-division zones were selected and whether there is another potential approach for this.
- 2) Inclusion of potential evapotranspiration (ET) and actual ET in the correlation analysis, if possible.
- 3) Simple surface point validation of reanalysis datasets for random selected points.
- 4) Illustrate the history of land use/land cover in China instead of just one snap shot so that the agriculture development trend can be compared with the precipitation trend, and potential ET/actual ET if possible.

Both reviewers also had very good suggested “Specific Comments” and “Minor Issues” that should be considered in the revised manuscript.

If the authors are willing to revise the manuscript and explain how each of the above points were addressed by both reviewers, the article will be considered again for publi-

cation. Both reviewers are willing to review the article again once the edits have been made.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-756>, 2018.

HESSD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

