

Interactive comment on “Risk assessment of meteorological drought in China under RCP scenarios from 2016 to 2050” by Kuo Li and Jie Pan

Kuo Li and Jie Pan

hqlk2000@163.com

Received and published: 3 April 2017

We think the rejection is arbitrary and irrational. The methods used in this article are developed by ourselves. We have cited proper literatures which are put into the right place. The whole article is interpreting the process of risk assessment of meteorological drought in China under RCP scenarios from 2016 to 2050. Risk assessment is the core of the article, in which the climate simulation is just the background. HadGEM2-ES is more proper than the other GCMs in East Asia. Many studies have been done using HadGEM in China. So we choose it for the risk assessment. The reason of using SPI-12 is explained in Page 4, Line 141-155. The weighting factors are based on experts experience; they are scored by 20 experts who are familiar with SPI and drought.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



The data of vulnerability evaluation comes from Chinese statistical yearbooks. The reason of choosing these vulnerability evaluation indexes is revealed in “2.3 Vulnerability evaluation”. The figures have enough quality to reveal the distribution of hazard, vulnerability and risk under RCPs. The box plot figures are modified and explained. The maps in Figure 4 show the hazards in the future. It is not necessary to show the present hazard and risk in this article. Although your rejection is unreasonable, we also thank you for your reviewing.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-257, 2016.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

