Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 4, C1741-C1743, 2011

www.atmos-meas-tech-discuss.net/4/C1741/2011/ © Author(s) 2011. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribute 3.0 License.



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

# **Anonymous Referee #4**

Received and published: 9 October 2011

### 1 Recommendation

This manuscript is a bibliometric study of the literature dealing with disdrometer. I have the feeling that this corresponds to the first chapter of a PhD thesis dealing with DSD and its measurements. My main concern is that there is no scientific contribution presented in this manuscript, and this is a requirement for publication in AMT (according to the manuscript evaluation criteria) and in any other scientific journal. So this manuscript cannot be published in AMT (nor in any other journal).

In addition to this "conceptual" mismatch with AMT requirements, there are major issues listed below. I also list a few minor comments.

C1741

## 2 General comments

- 1. The authors do not provide any explanations about what this study could be useful to. What are the scientific domains/questions which could benefit from such a literature study?
- Some types of disdrometers are not included: in aprticular, I think of the videodisdrometer or 2DVD (Kruger and Krajewski, JAOT, 2002), acoustic disdrometer (Henson, JAOT, 2004) and underwater acoustic disdrometer (Nystuen, JAOT, 2001).
- 3. Some important references are missing. For example, for the Parsivel (Loffler-Mang and Joss, JAOT, 2000), the MRR (Peters et al., BER, 2002), the Thies (Frasson et al., AR, 2011).
- 4. There are only 36 references in total, which is a bit limited for a literature review / bibliometric study...
- 5. Stating that Bringi's career (see p.6049, l.23) "was based on comparing data from the disdrometer with different types of radar, and even with other instruments and satellite data" indicates a serious lack of knowledge of his work. In addition, Bringi is still alive and not retired, so the past tense is not appropriate.

# 3 Specific comments

- 1. Table 1 is not clear: what are "K L R..."? In addition, there is nof referrence to Table 1 in the text.
- 2. Figure 6: I do not think that IEEE is an author...

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