

Interactive comment on “Recent trends in daily rainfall extremes over Montenegro (1951–2010)” by D. Burić et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 11 May 2015

This manuscript is an interesting attempt to study an important issue in climatology and therefore, deserves its publication in NHESS provided that the necessary corrections will be made. Since referee #1 did an excellent job in pointing out many of the weak points of the manuscript and suggested how to rephrase some sentences, I will not repeat it. I completely agree with his/her suggestions. I would add that I was not convinced after reading this manuscript, that extreme rainfall events in Montenegro should be regarded as a major threat. I am not convinced either if there is a significant increasing trend of such events. The authors present some significant trends in few stations and in some seasons. However, as stations are not evenly distributed over space; where more than half of northern Montenegro is monitored by less than one third of the stations (7 out of 23), just counting the number of stations with significant trends,

C662

is misleading. Furthermore, in p.2356, l. 17-18 - the authors state that "Tendencies towards drier conditions are mainly pronounced in south-western parts of the country". In my opinion, if this statement is correct and there are indeed more dry days, it should be beneficiary to tourism and therefore I cannot understand their worry reflected from the last sentence: (p.2357, l.16) "...since tourism is one of the main economic strategies..." Specific comments: p.2352, l.10 - The authors must define the NAO index more accurately as the standardized atmospheric pressure between Ponta Delgada (Azores) and Akureyri (Iceland) and not as written. As not all readers are familiar with the geography and climatology of Montenegro, it would be beneficial to add station names and isohyets depicting mean annual rainfall in Fig. 1. p.2355, first paragraph, the authors ignored completely the fact that in summer in almost half of the stations they found negative trends in their description of Fig. 7. I share the suggestion of referee #1 to reduce the number of figures.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 2347, 2015.