

Interactive comment on “The concurrence of Atmospheric Rivers and explosive cyclogenesis in the North Atlantic and North Pacific basins” by Jorge Eiras-Barca et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 9 November 2017

Looking into the response from the authors to my comments, they've pointed out that one of my comments was incomplete. The complete comment is the following:

P9L20-26: This part of the study produced the expected results, which is good, but it can go beyond that. What the composites are showing are the 80% ECs associated with ARs and the 60% NECs not associated with ARs. What is more interesting is to find out why there are some EC that are not associated with ARs. Why these cyclones still develop explosively? Or why are there NECs that are associated with ARs? Why these cyclone do not develop explosively? These questions could be at least partially addressed by separating the cyclones in four categories, namely EC-AR, EC-nonAR,

C1

NEC-AR, NEC-nonAR, and producing composites for each one of these. Are there noticeable differences between EC-AR and NEC-AR, or between EC-nonAR and NEC-nonAR? Changing this analysis will also require changing the last bullet point in the conclusions (P11L10-11).

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-2017-76>, 2017.

C2