Natural Hazards
and Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

Discussions

EGU

Interactive comment on "Evaluation of a combined drought indicator and its predictive potential for agricultural droughts in Southern Spain" *by* María del Pilar Jiménez-Donaire et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 25 May 2019

This is an interesting work. The idea of combining soil, atmosphere, and vegetation status in one index reflects the developing holistic understanding of the soil-vegetation-atmosphere system. There are two issues that preclude the publication of the manuscript in its present form. A. Four important questions are not answered.

1. How did the authors arrive to the number of classes and boundaries shown in Table 3? 2. How did the authors evaluate the index? What was the objective way to do that? The Fig. 6 looks undoubtedly good, but no method of the index quantitative assessment is provided in the manuscript. 3. Does the proposed index work better than previously proposed indices? 4. What is the purpose of the index development?

Who and how will use it?

B. The English is unsatisfactory. Many statements are incomprehensible. Here are examples from the P. 1. L 21 "appreciated under different forms" What does this mean? L. 23 "proper definition" What does this mean? L. 24 "phenomenon for this reason, and of the spatial extent of its effects." What does this mean? L. 27 "influence affect the normal manifestations of the society" What does this mean? L 29 – 30 "denominated Old World Drought Atlas" What does this mean?

Terms are used that have not been defined.

Examples 6/25 "which phase" the phase was never defined SPI-3 to identify the first "level of precipitation deficit" What levels are you talking about. 6/27 "This study proposes a CDI that combines three combines, as mentioned before"

Some text pieces reflect simple negligence. Examples "representative value for loam clay according to USDA classification." Does not exist 4.3 NDVIA insurance data were gently supplied by

---