

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.

J. Grieser

juergen.grieser@rms.com

Received and published: 23 November 2012

Again: The authors pretend that the VASCLimO dataset belongs to the GPCC at various locations in this manuscript, e.g. on page 928 lines 1 and 2, page 958, lines 4 to 6, while they attribute it to Beck et al. (2005) on page 256, lines 25 to 28. The VASCLimO dataset is neither produced on behalf nor by means of the GPCC. They got it neither as a gift nor was it sold to the GPCC. I developed this dataset in a private initiative on my private computers. Two of the authors deliberately published wrong statements in Rudolf and Schneider (2005) explicitly claiming the VASCLimO product as a GPCC

C255

product.

On page 943, lines 11 and 12, the authors claim ‘Since year 2008, when Version 4 of the precipitation reanalysis was issued, the GPCC has enhanced its gridding method to a climate anomaly method.’ Note that the VASCLimO dataset of which the GPCC still claims that it is produced by the GPCC is published in 2005 and anomalies are interpolated!

On page 951, lines 12 to 19 the authors indicate that the datasets discussed in the ‘following section’ (sec.7) are based on anomalies from GPCC’s climatological normals. This might be true for some of the datasets discussed in sec. 7. I doubt that it is true for HOMPRA since this dataset does not exist yet. (Why do they discuss a non-existing dataset in the first place?) It is definitely not true for the VASCLimO dataset which is based on the FAO Agromet climate data which are not at all quality controlled and cover a wide range of observation periods.

From page 941, line 24, to page 942, line 3, they shortly explain why the use of Shepard’s method as it was done by the GPCC for 20 years now is not reasonable, without, however, mentioning that they used it as is all the years. They did not mention that I proposed doing the simple changes to adapt the fortran code they bought from David Legates already in 2002. They do not mention that they react now that I informed the scientific community about their misuse of Shepard’s method.

Their simple solution of throwing away all but 219 out of 4000 stations in Germany instead of using them by meaningful interpolation lacks any explanation (page 948 lines 16 to 18). It remains open which stations are used and why?

They cite Rudolf et al. 1992 where two of the authors claimed that Shepard’s method deliberately extrapolates out of the range of observations as if they still believe the non-sense they wrote, maybe out of ignorance.

Given the fact that most of the authors have deliberately published wrong statements

C256

several times in recent years as well as the wrong statements they clearly wrote in this manuscript, the question is not what is wrong with this manuscript but what is right. Who knows? Maybe not even the authors.

Granting the honor of a scientific publication to the authors reduces scientific publication to storytelling and paves the way for charlatans to try and publish in ESSD.

Juergen Grieser.

Please feel free to contact me at j.grieser@rmx.de

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