Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, S1694–S1695, 2006

www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/3/S1694/2006/ © Author(s) 2006. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons License.



## **HESSD**

3, S1694-S1695, 2006

Interactive Comment

# Interactive comment on "The scale of typhoon RUSA" by N. W. Kim et al.

# **Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 19 December 2006

#### General comments:

The paper presents a case study of the typhoon RUSA by describing its scale. RUSA which hits Korea in August 2002 caused severe damage and flooding due to torrential rainfall amounts. The authors use the PMP and DAD analysis to quantify its scale and conclude that they should be modified.

The overall paper has several severe shortcomings which are:

- the overall paper has a very descriptive character
- the introduction gives a historical overview of severe rain fall events in Korea but not an overview on the state of the art in the field. It does not contain novel concepts, ideas or tools which are applied to the case.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

**Discussion Paper** 

EGU

S1694

- the description of the meteorological conditions (section 2) does not contain one meteorological chart. The terms used are not standard (cold atmosphere, movement of velocity, etc.).
- explain the term: moisture vector in Fig. 1.
- it is very difficult to follow the description of section 3 if one is not familiar with the geographical locations of the names. A geographical map would have been very helpful.
- it is not mentioned which analysis method has been used to derive Fig. 3 and Fig.4. A map of the stations which enter the analysis is missing.
- the conclusion from section 3 fig.5 through fig. 8 that there is a large rainfall variability is not really new.
- Section 4 evaluates PMP and DAD. The selection of the precipitation data is only described in a qualitative way but not in a quantitative way (what means ... too large ... line 5)
- PMP and DAD are never explained. A short description would have been very helpful.
- The reference list contains only grey literature and is remarkable short.

To summarize: The paper does not contain enough scientific merit to be regarded for publication in HESS.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 3147, 2006.

## **HESSD**

3, S1694-S1695, 2006

Interactive Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

**EGU**