

Interactive comment on “Ability of an Australian reanalysis dataset to characterise sub-daily precipitation” by Suwash Chandra Acharya et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 10 February 2020

The article is sound and makes a modest contribution (by examining sub-daily time scales) to body of literature on the evaluation of reanalysis rainfall data. I think it should be published subject to some clarification. Some items for correction / clarification:

L19: quantile should be replaced with percentile.

L47-48: what does it mean that BARRA is driven by ERA-Interim?

L104 - 115: this seems an overly critical view of radar rainfall. IN the assessment of the sources of error in radar retrievals, are the authors referring to their own gauge-correction procedure or other published work? Further, I understand that the authors use the radar data to evaluate the spatial distribution of rainfall, but how does aggregating the 1.5km data to 12km (which I assume they did for a fair evaluation) change the inter-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



pretation of the spatial patterns for such small regions of Australia. At 12km resolution, an evaluation against satellite retrievals (e.g. GPM IMERG final product) may provide the same information but for the whole country.

* Box plots in Fig. 2 are very difficult to see on the printed version. Perhaps a landscape layout for figure 2 might help?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-432>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

