

Interactive comment on “Rain research with disdrometers: a bibliometric review” by M. Fernandez-Raga et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 23 September 2011

This paper clearly belongs to a bibliometrics journal rather than to AMT or to any other atmospheric journal. It does not provide any substantial contribution within the scope of this journal or field.

In terms of scientific quality, the paper neglects recent developments in the field. The paper is supposed to provide "perspective that serves to guide future studies", but that is never delivered. Also, the use of the "disdrometer" keyword in the topic field as a criteria for the search leaves out research on characterized as spectropluviometers, optical rain gauges, or others. The references to global climate studies in the introduction is off topic, with the whole introduction been bitty and incoherent. The choice of WOS is acknowledged to be motivated by the easiness of use, without regard to scien-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive Comment

tific criteria. The main part of the paper is a mere segmentation of WOS outputs. The main conclusion, namely that Tokay and Bringi are the most cited authors in the field is not a novelty for anyone. Moreover, it is irrelevant in terms of this paper providing a contribution to the field. The same about another conclusion, the dominance of AMS journals in disdrometer research. Hardly relevant in terms of serving to guide to future studies.

The paper should therefore be rejected for final publication into AMT. I'd recommend make the necessary adjustments in terms of acknowledging recent developments and resubmit to a bibliometrics journal.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 4, 6041, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

