

Interactive comment on “High-resolution stable isotope signature of a land-falling Atmospheric River in southern Norway” by Yongbiao Weng et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 January 2021

The research presented by Weng et al. deals in detail with winter 2016 AR event in Norway. Although the study is really interesting, some parts are a bit hard to read. This is especially obvious in parts of introduction, but as well in discussion. In general, discussion part of the paper is lacking references. As well, references should be written properly and not using acronyms.

- p3, line 10 – p4 line 11: This part does not belong to the Introduction and should be moved to later part of the manuscript. - p4 line 13-22: This part should be rewritten in more concise way. - p4 line 28: the reference to web page should be written differently and should be listed properly in list of references. Same goes for P4 line 32 and P8 line

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



3. - p9 fig 1. I believe panel b would be sufficient since you are using ERA-Interm data. Thus, in p8 lines 4-5 are not necessary. - p21 (Table 1 and line 3-16) it would be worthy to put observed data in the table to enable easier comparison. Doing so, this part of the text can be significantly reduced or even eliminated. - Fig 8. It is really hard to read it. Legend should be set to be representative for all panels (this way looks that is valid only for b panel). As well, please check solid and dotted lines in figure description are designated properly. - p27, line 24. Other factors - p 28, line 7 ???

Interactive comment on Weather Clim. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/wcd-2020-58>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

