Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-143-AC2, 2017

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

Interactive comment on "Role of NAO and ENSO in the anomalous precipitation in the southern part of China – study on the two contrary high impact weather and climate cases" *by* Qiuxia Wu

Q. Wu

wuqx@cma.gov.cn

Received and published: 21 November 2017

Dear Refree 2:

It's pleasure for us to have a chance to get your comments for this manuscript again!

Question 1: Although these are useful knowledge, the represenativeness of these large scale circulation setting is however questionable and I don't know that only two cases would help to predict such abnormal conditions as the author claimed. I think that these case study probably should go to Monthly Weather Review of journals about weather which are perhaps more suitable.

First, the two cases are highlighted under the climate background, and the corresponding abnormal physical fields are statistically significant referring to the 30-year climatology of 1980-2009. Moreover, climate could be seen as the accumulation of weather for a time span. So, I think that climate and weather should not be seen as two completely independent concepts, they are closely linked to each other to some extent. Therefore, this manuscript might be suitable to MWR or Weather, but it indeed is suitable to NHESSD.

Second, this manuscript's title is "Role of NAO and ENSO in the anomalous precipitation in the southern part of China – study on the two contrary high impact weather and climate cases", so we just tried to explain the role of NAO and ENSO in the climate anomalies for the two specific cases. We did not make any prediction of such abnormal conditions in other cases. Could you please read the paper of Trenberth and Guillemot (1996) with the title "Physical processes involved in the 1988 drought and 1993 floods in North America".

Question 2: Another issue with the paper is English and the structure of the paper. There are a lot minor issues including using abbreviation without full names, the variance of PC1 and PC4 are different in Introduction and Figure 12 caption; some ïňĄgure captions are incomplete, too many ïňĄgures etc.

About this paper's language and structure, if you think they are not perfect, please make a clear detailed list for this issue. For example, which line, sentence or word is not good, and so on, and why, and what you think is good one? and why? Also about the structure of this paper, why you think our structure is not good, and what you think is good one, and why?

About abbreviation without full names, I could be certain to say that each abbreviation has full names in this paper!

About the difference of PC1 and PC4 between Introduction and Figure 12 caption, I checked the two figures. Figure 12 caption had clearly made a definition of principal

components of precipitation field for the winter (DJF). Figure 2 caption told us the analyzed period is Jan. 1961 to Dec. 2010, that means all seasons, including winter. So the difference between them is caused by the different analyzed periods of data. About too many figures, I want to say that, no too many figures, this paper selected the suitable figures for demonstration. Could you give us a clear explanation about which figures you think should be omitted, and why, and how to deal with the corresponding information of this figure in the suitable part of this paper?

Thanks for your hard work on this manuscript!

Best Wishes

Qiuxia Wu

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-143, 2017.