

# ***Interactive comment on “PAttern REtrieval or deNegation Testing Scheme (PARENTS) v.1.0 – Identifying the degree of presence of given patterns in spatial time series” by Benjamin Müller et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 14 February 2020

This paper describes a testing “scheme [which] seeks a different approach to identifying these surface characteristics that control the generation of such observation time series”. Right away, I am confused about the objective of the paper. The sentence above is a good example – what approach, what surface characteristics, and what observation time series are the authors’ talking about?

Abstract and the first few sentences of the paper do not clearly state the objectives, or even a problem statement that the paper will address. The Introduction, the first paragraph makes a general statement, but does not point to a problem or issue that

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



the work attempts to answer or solve.

One very simple reason why this paper is difficult to understand is that the authors are using indirect language to describe their ideas, which obfuscates their meaning. An example of this is the use of a lot of acronyms very early on in the paper. The composition would be much stronger if the authors simplified the paper to remove extensive use of acronyms.

At some point in the Introduction, the authors start to talk about 'TS'. So, perhaps this is a focus of their work, but it is not clear. They also randomly talk about PCA, which may or may not be an interesting way to examine TS. But, again, it is not clear.

The paper has unconventional organization. I suggest following a more standard flow. For example, having two results sections is confusing. These could be combined to make it easier for the reader to follow. There is no discussion of the results, per sec. A discussion would be nice, and perhaps this could help the authors to organize their ideas from Introduction to Discussion and Conclusions.

I think if this paper were rewritten to have clear objectives, and cleaner /clearer flow of ideas and expression, it would be easier to follow the reasoning in the paper from concept to results/discussion.

My recommendation is to return this paper to the authors for major revision.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-563>, 2019.

## HESSD

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

