

Interactive comment on “Precipitation measurement intercomparison in the Qilian Mountains, Northeastern Tibetan Plateau” by R. Chen et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 12 May 2015

The author seem not understood my words. I know the WMO procedure could be improved, but it was just relating to the wind speed in theoretically. Generally, the equ. must be suitable for anywhere you using similar data. As well, I knew the the equ. was gained in Tianshan region by huge field observations and improved many times. Surely, you can improve it too. But it theoretically not local! What you should improve is that classification for precipitation-type, that is local due to the parameter in the emu. is variable. There is new publication by K Yang (may not 1st author), a new method has been developed. The author no need explain your classification again. Frankly the reviewer knew that very well. I note one of the co-author of manuscript is E Kang, I would like to suggest you discuss my words with E Kang.

C742

Again, my comment: what you should pay attention is classification, for the other, you can do your work but it is not so necessary theoretically.

Interactive comment on The Cryosphere Discuss., 9, 2201, 2015.