

Interactive comment on “Millennium-length precipitation Reconstruction over South-eastern Asia: a Pseudo-Proxy Approach” by Stefanie Talento et al.

Stefanie Talento et al.

stefanie.talento@geogr.uni-giessen.de

Received and published: 26 April 2019

We thank the reviewer for the constructive comments and suggestions. We have given full consideration to the comments in the revised manuscript.

Please find below a point-by-point reply to the questions raised. A marked-up manuscript version (with tracked changes) converted into a pdf is also uploaded.

Interactive comment on “Millennium-length precipitation Reconstruction over South-eastern Asia: a Pseudo-Proxy Approach” by Stefanie Talento et al. Anonymous Referee #2 Received and published: 28 March 2019 1 Abstract This work presents a se-

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



ries of Pseudo Proxy Experiments carried out with two families of CFR techniques: one based on Bayesian techniques, albeit with several variations based on using clustering techniques; and the analog method. The results show that the latter performs worse than the former, especially at decadal time scales. Still, the results generally demonstrate the feasibility of the application this type of technique to produce a gridded hydroclimate product for the South-eastern Asia. 2 General comment I find the work interesting and comprehensive. The proposed methods are somewhat innovative (at least the part concerning the clustering techniques previous to the BHM method), and cover an interesting topic with plenty of potential applications. My only important concern pertains the way the analog method has been used. There are many choices that would have an impact in the skill of this approach, and I have the impression that the authors have used those leading to the worst results. I think this introduces an artificial bias in the study, which partly relies on the comparison with this method. Despite this issue, I can only identify some minor points that deserve the review of the authors to include better explanations or corrections. 3 Major comments I'm surprised by the lack of skill demonstrated by the analog method in this exercise. There exist references where the skill of this approach is remarkable, or at the very least comparable to other approaches. The study by Gómez-Navarro et al. (2015), cited the authors, shows that the analog method performs very similar to BHM. This study is especially relevant because it targets at the same variable, and therefore the results should be expected to be similar. Instead, the present article seems to contradict frontally this reference, which in my opinion is too briefly discussed in the text. I think the authors should deepen on the the issue of why is the analog method so inferior here. This is an important aspect, as the analog method is used as benchmark. I'm concerned with the fact that the way the method has been applied may not be optimal, or the most sensible, which artificially reduces the skill of the approach, therefore lowering the skill of the benchmark and biasing (positively) the skill obtained with the Bayesian techniques. A major problem I see is the way the pool of analogs is built. The most important caveat of the analog method is the size of this pool. If the authors wanted to use this approach

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

to create a reconstruction, they shall try to increase the size of the pool. In this case, the obvious choice would be to use the whole LME data. There is no sensible reason for using a single model realisation when there are many more. I do not think it makes a fair comparison with the BHM method, because the analog method could be, if the authors allowed it, much more accurate with no additional computational cost. I do not fully understand how the decadal reconstruction is carried out. This should be explained more clearly. I guess that the instrumental data is previously averaged, in a fixed number of windows (therefore reducing the amount of data to 1/10th) and then they use it to perform the PPE. Right? Doing so, the authors reduce to a 1/10th the size of the pool of analogs, which again may explain the lack of skill. But again, a more sensible approach would be to use some sort of running means of 10 years, where the same year can contribute up to 10 slightly different decadal analogs. This would not reduce the size of the pool so severely, and would allow having a pool with more subtle variations, able to adapt itself better to past situations.

Agreed. We implemented the proposed modification for the Analogue method with decadal resolution (using 10-years windows for the generation of the pool of analogues) and clarified it in the text. The skill of this new version of the Analogue method is slightly higher than the version we used before (thanks for the suggestion). However, relative to the BHM techniques the performance is still inferior and, thus, the main comparative results remain unchanged.

Regarding the comparison with Gómez-Navarro et al. (2015): In their case they used as pool of analogues a second simulation: a millennium-long a highly-resolved regional run. We don't have access to a millennium-long regional simulation for our study area and, therefore, the same analysis can't be done. A paragraph discussing this apparent contradiction was added in the "Results" section.

Respect to using another run of the LME as pool for analogues: In fact we tried this and the results are comparable to the ones showed using the instrumental-period data. However, the final decision to only show results for the instrumental-period of ana-

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

logues was in favour of mimicking conditions we can have when attempting a real-world reconstruction. In a real-world scenario we can have the instrumental-period data and repeat the exercise as we did in this Manuscript. In real-world we wouldn't have another run of "real-world" to make the same comparison.

An important issue barely addressed in the manuscript pertains the computational requirements. In Page 13, line 36 they are briefly mentioned, but I'd like to know more. Is the clustering related to this? Is the clustering, indeed, mostly aimed at the reduction of the computational cost? How does the computational cost in the BHM techniques compare to the analog method? These are important operational aspects with important implications in the applicability of these methods in real reconstructions.

The clustering was originally intended as an experiment for augmenting the skill of the BHM. However, as results show, the skill doesn't improve (also doesn't deteriorate much) and therefore, the advantageous computing-times come in as an important asset.

While the Analogue has almost no computational cost, the BHM is very computationally-demanding. For the area of study (with 366 grid points) at annual resolution (1156 years in total), the BHM version without pre-clustering requires in a standard Laptop a computation time of around 5 days. The computing times can be reduced around 50% with the pre-clustering scheme. A sentence providing this information was added in the "Summary and Conclusions" section.

4 Minor comments Page 1, lines 29-31: What does it mean that "more relevant value is encapsulated" I think this is a severe judgement about the superiority of BHM that is not so clearly justified.

Agreed, modified accordingly: " The superiority of the Bayesian schemes indicates that directly modelling the space and time precipitation field variability is more appropriate than just relying in a pool of observational-based analogues, in which certain precipitation regimes might be absent."

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Page 2: the acronym CFR is defined twice.

Agreed, modified accordingly.

Page 3, line 36: “Asia We usie” (dot missing and spelling error).

Agreed, modified accordingly.

Page 4: Why is JJA precipitation the only target? Agreed, we added an explanation for this in the Introduction: “In this work only summer precipitation is targeted as the pseudo-proxy network selected is inspired by real-world indicators of summer hydroclimatic variations (see Data and Methodology section).”

Page 6, line 30: a space after comma is missing here.

Agreed, modified accordingly.

Page 7: I do not fully understand the explanation. Shouldn't be a vector with as many dimensions as the number of grid points, rather than a parameter?

In this version of the code, μ is a parameter. To help the reader we extended this explanation and moved earlier in the text the methodology of standardizing and de-standardizing before and after application of BHM. Please, see in the text under the “BHM” section.

Page 7, line 21: If only 63% of time series pass the test, does it mean that in the rest this important hypothesis that BHM relies on is being violated? There is an important fraction of the grid points where this test is not past!

Although 37% of the sites don't pass the test, the algorithm still produces a valuable reconstruction. We added the following sentence in the text: “Despite the Gaussian conditions are not met in all the grid points the model is still valid, although it might not be the most optimal fit at these locations.”

Page 7, line 33: What does it tell us that this assumption is flawed? Should we be

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



concerned? If not, why not?

This means the model might not be the best fit for this data. But, as it still produces skillful reconstructions, no concerns should be taken. See previous answer also.

Page 12, line 5-7: In the same direction that in previous points, I find surprising that Bayesian algorithms are successful, given that in this region the hypothesis of normality, which these approaches rely on, is not past.

This means the model might not be the best fit for this data. But, as it still produces skillful reconstructions, no concerns should be taken. See previous two answers, please.

Page 12, line 13: why the clustering deteriorates the result? I would expect the opposite: if the method can reduce its complexity, it should be more easily fitted to the data for each subregion.

We don not have a definite answer for this question, but we present possible hypothesis for such a behaviour. We added 1 paragraph at the end of the “Results” section discussing this topic: “Disentangling the reasons leading to a partial deterioration of skill when coupling the BHM to Clustering algorithms will require additional experiments. However, we hypothesize that the main reason for such behaviour is related to the loss of information from geographical-neighbours. While during clustering geographical-neighbors can be separated, the information from such sites is taken into account in the covariance matrix structure of BHM and, therefore, losing information from close locations might affect the final performance.”

Page 13, line 12-14: the results for CRPS seem to contradict those for correlation. Does BHM perform better for annual reconstructions (if we trust correlation), or for decadal ones (if we trust CRPS)?

It is not a contradiction. These measures measure different properties of the reconstructions.

Page 15, line 16: “On other hand” (I think "the" is missing in this expression).

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

Agreed.

Figure 3: I could not understand how this figure is obtained. How are the latitudinal bands operated? Are all grid points coupled within each band, and the average of the correlation calculated?

Agreed, an expanded explanation was incorporated to the Figure caption.

Fig 4 and following. I think it is necessary to include the locations of the proxies to facilitate the identification of skill and its relation to the presence of proxies. Perhaps adding country boundaries would also help in the discussion of the results.

Agreed for including the locations of proxies. However, we decided not to include country-borders.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.earth-syst-dynam-discuss.net/esd-2019-1/esd-2019-1-AC2-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-2019-1>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

