



EGUsphere, referee comment RC1
<https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-541-RC1>, 2022
© Author(s) 2022. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on egusphere-2022-541

Anonymous Referee #1

Referee comment on "Forecasting the cost of drought events in France by super learning" by Geoffrey Ecoto and Antoine Chambaz, EGU sphere, <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2022-541-RC1>, 2022

- L7-L8- the statements need to be cited.
 - In L16, In (Charpentier et al., 2021), I suggest the bracket be removed.
 - In Line 30- I don't know if the authors have a reason for not capitalizing the abbreviated words in OSSASL.
 - In L115, L173, 207, 295- the use of "so-called" I do want to believe it is an adjectival description of the succeeding nouns, but in the various context it has been used, it sounds more of a sarcastic use than what you intended it for in the sentence. Also, the use of so-called with OSASSL, I found inappropriate as it is still a new algorithm that has not gained ground. I suggest the authors find another appropriate use for the "so-called" term in the highlighted sentences.
 - The use of brackets should be well defined, example is at the end of L191, L193, there are cases of "unopened and opened parenthesis with no closing".
 - Sections 4.1: Starting the paragraph with "In fact" is a disconnect from the previous discussion
 - L177- "more details to follow." I suggest the sentence should be enclosed in a bracket rather than the hyphen.
 - L190, L239- the use of a one-sentence paragraph, I suggest should be avoided altogether.
 - The sentence in L190-L191 needs to be rephrased, to give an appropriate meaning of what the authors meant there.
 - Section 4.2 should be properly named. "Training of what?"
 - In Figure 5, the spelling of drought, not "droughth" should be checked in the map presented.
 - Instead of the description with "left-hand side map" and "right-hand side map" I suggest the authors should label the maps with "Map A" and "Map B" or in any other format suitable for easy visual comprehension by readers.
 - In Table 2, I think the table should be properly formatted.
 - L263-267, the sentence is too long, I suggest it be split as appropriate.
 - L-290- "and have been since then" should be properly rephrased.
 - In summary, I suggest
-
- The authors need to do more editing and use more technical language in their work.

- The sectioning of the paper needs to be improved upon. L 199 is not a befitting section name. I suggest it should be either expunged or properly rephrased. Also, regarding the sections, if the authors decide to retain the structure of the sections, then they should give proper numbering to them.
- The paper is having an inadequate coherence in the flow of thought, aside from sectioning which has been mentioned earlier, the authors should, in addition, ensure a consistent flow of thought from one paragraph to the other, and from one section to the other.
- The authors should cite relevant works in their paper for validation.

I think the paper has been able to explain the process of the super learner, but they still need to do more work in explaining how their developed algorithms was able to forecast the cost of drought events and how this algorithm should be better considered than previously used ones if there were any.