

Interactive comment on “Projected intensification of sub-daily and daily rainfall extremes in convection-permitting climate model simulations over North America: Implications for future Intensity–Duration–Frequency curves” by Alex J. Cannon and Silvia Innocenti

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 23 November 2018

Dear All:

Overall, I found the manuscript to be reasonably well polished with minor editorial and presentation issues (see below). If there are any thing "major" to comment on: The paper, at times, strikes me to be on the technical side which may irk broader audiences (i.e. stakeholder, data users, climate modellers with less background in extreme value theory). That said, I appreciate the paper's conciseness. While detail discussion is

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



technical, the conclusions is very accessible to the general audience. Overall, I think the paper is acceptable with some minor presentation changes

Specific comment and questions:

Abstract lines 13-15: What are the physical meanings of changes to GEVSS parameters? That information may be too technical for an abstract.

Table 1: A horizontal separator for each dataset item may make the Table somewhat easier to follow.

Pg 12 Lines 8: “from the 488 IDF curve TBRG stations shown in Figure 1.” ← This may require rephrasing. Perhaps something like “... from the 488 IDF curves derived from TBRG stations; the station locations are shown in Figure 1”.

Figure 7 captions/Pg 16 line 15: “Results are compared with the IDF curves disseminated by ECCC” should be mentioned in the caption as well for the sake of clarity.

Page 16 Lines 30-31 to Page 17 lines ~10: This is an example why overly technical discussion may bury important end user result. It will help the general reader if “For example, if the goal is to assess whether there is evidence for a steepening of IDF curve in the future” to stand out from the rest of the discussion. Perhaps a paragraph break will help here?

Best Regards Anonymous Reviewer

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2018-290>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

