

Interactive comment on “A description of the global land-surface precipitation data products of the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre with sample applications including centennial (trend) analysis from 1901–present” by A. Becker et al.

G. Humphries (Referee)

humphries.grant@gmail.com

Received and published: 23 November 2012

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper.

As I opened the document, I realized that I was in for a long-haul on this paper. I was, however, happy to see the detail the authors put into it. It is clear that they have a thorough understanding of their product(s) and methods.

I did, however, have a hard time reading through this for several reasons: 1) The English poor in many places, and I found myself reading and re-reading many sentences

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



to try and get the message of certain lines.

2) I found the high number of acronyms somewhat frustrating and difficult to follow.

3) The number of sub-sections was very distracting. Many of those sub-sections were too short, and in some cases, redundant to information previously presented in the paper.

I believe that this paper should be accepted providing some major revisions take place.

Please see below for a list of things I believe need to be improved upon prior to final acceptance:

The paper requires heavy English editing, and I would recommend that the paper be first put through a rigorous edit by a native English speaker. I found many sentences were missing articles, or were worded in ways that did not make much sense. I have not gone through the entire article to point them all out, but have highlighted a few examples in the PDF document attached.

I believe that sections 4.2 and 4.3 could have been more concisely worded and moved to the introduction.

Section 4.3 You should not compare the methods if you are not presenting the results in this paper. I would suggest removing this whole section, and just focusing on the product you are presenting in THIS paper. (i.e. remove this section and related figures)

Section 5.2 - Line 7 pg 948. Why are you using both? They are essentially two different ways of measuring the same thing. Choose one or the other. (What about Root Mean Squared Deviation?)

Section 5.2, line 16 pg 948. - Are you removing these stations randomly? how did you choose those 4000 stations in Germany to be removed?

Section 5.2 line 19 pg 948 - What resolution were the bins?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Section 6.1 - I am not sure what the point of this section really is other than to reiterate what you have already told us in previous sections. This section can be removed.

Section 7. You have Way too many sub-headings in here. It gets too distracting. You can cut back on this by merging 7.1.1 into section 7.1 (state the product, and then a quick example of its use).

Figure 3 and Figure 4: Be consistent with your figures. The backgrounds should be coloured the same, and you should label the axes in Figure 4. The idea being to ensure that I can look at the figure and immediately understand what the graph is saying. I would switch the Y-axes on figure 4 as well so that it is consistent with Figure 3 (i.e. number of stations on the left), and remove the line that shows the total number of stations (the black line) in figure 4 as it is redundant with figure 3's line that shows the exact same information.

Figure 12: I cannot figure out the point of this figure. I get the gist of what you are showing, but I do not believe it is necessary.

Figure 13: As above - why use both? they are similar. Use one or the other

Figure 20: I do not think you need to include this figure. There are already enough and it makes it too much to read through. If you make a manual for your data product, that's where I would put this figure.

For some more specific comments on English, I have made highlighted comments in the attached PDF document.

Thank you again, and kudos to the authors for their hard work on this paper.

Sincerely Grant Humphries

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.earth-syst-sci-data-discuss.net/5/C251/2012/essdd-5-C251-2012-supplement.pdf>

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., 5, 921, 2012.

ESSDD

5, C251–C254, 2012

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C254

