

Interactive comment on “Local models reveal greater spatial variation than global grids in an urban mosaic: Hong Kong climate, vegetation, and topography rasters” by Brett Morgan and Benoit Guénard

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 12 January 2019

General comments

The manuscript is not sufficiently organized and confused with no novelty and explicit research question. There are many too short subsections, which should be merged. Methods are not much clear because details and relevant references have not been provided. Consequently, it is not much easy to follow results and discussion. The Authors have used data associated at support sizes very different. They should take into account the change of support.

C1

Detailed comments

The title should be made more informative and effective. The Abstract has not the required structure and does not summarize the whole manuscript. It should be organized better and explain clearly what was done, what was found and what are the main conclusions. Generally, the first sentence should provide briefly the rationale of the topic being investigated.

Keywords are missing.

The Introduction section is confused and not sufficiently organized. Particularly, reading the title, one is expecting to find in the Introduction the presentation of what the title promises, but unfortunately it is not so. The Introduction should be improved and the topic being investigated should be explained clearly. The novelty and objectives are missing. A manuscript to be considered a research paper, a research question must be clearly stated. In addition, the Authors should explain the gap in the topic being investigated and how their study fills such a gap.

A well-organized Materials and Methods section is missing. The sections ‘2 Study area’ and ‘3 Methods’ should be included in a new Materials and Methods section which allows readers to follow the progress of the objectives in the manuscript and support results and discussion. In the methods, how data have been analysed and combined should be explained providing sufficient details. Particularly, the Authors should explain how they have taken into account the change of support problem to have all data associated to the same support size. Details and references on statistical methods are missing.

Results and Discussion sections should be improved and supported by a new Materials and Methods section.

Conclusions are poor: they should be improved and to show the improvement of our knowledge.

C2

