

Interactive comment on “Comparison of raingauge observations with modeled precipitation over Cyprus using Contiguous Rain Area analysis” by N. Tartaglione et al.

M. Paulat (Referee)

paulat@uni-mainz.de

Received and published: 1 June 2005

General comments:

The authors have verified a single precipitation event over Cyprus. The Cyprus rain gauge network is used to verify the BOLAM model forecast with the Contiguous Rain Area (CRA) analysis. When using this verification method one has to choose a criterium for the shifting value. This study tests the maximum correlation and minimum MSE criteria. In this case study it is found that the two criteria did not give the same results. For the presented specific case the correlation criterium gives the best result. I

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

think that it is important to mention that this result may not be generally valid, as written in the conclusion. In general, I think that the paper is clearly written. The only thing I'm not so happy about is that the conclusion of the presented work is not applicable in general. So far, it is only a case study and I would be interested in more results, especially in a statistical sense (more events).

Specific comments:

- 1.) On page 2357 line 27 there's a reference to figure 2 to show the high pressure system near the Caspian Sea. I cannot really see this pressure system.
- 2.) On page 2359 line 5: are there only rain gauges available for Western Cyprus or are there no rain gauges on the rest of the island or is this a political problem? You could say something about it.
- 3.) On page 2362 line 16: should read "column 3" instead of "column 2".
- 4.) On page 2364 line 16 and 17: you say something about the statistical significance. I think it is better to declare again that this significance refers to the correlation criterium. Otherwise it could be misleading for the reader who thinks about statistical significance in terms of several events.
- 5.) A few writing errors:
 - i) In the title should read "rain gauge" instead of "raingauge".
 - ii) On page 2357 line 4 to line 7: this sentence is written twice.
 - iii) On page 2359 line 5: should read "the island" instead of "island".

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 5, 2355, 2005.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Print Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)