

Interactive comment on “Hydrometeor classification from 2 dimensional videodisdrometer data” by J. Grazioli et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 16 April 2014

General Comments: Article provides new unique methods for identifying hydrometeor types from disdrometer data. Has potential to be useful for many applications.

While the article is well thought out, the grammatical errors make reading difficult. There are too many to list, so I would recommend having someone who specializes in English grammar help rework sentence structures. Also, carefully check spelling. There were a few major spelling issues, for example: hydrometeor in the title is spelled incorrectly.

Overall I would recommend this article for acceptance with minor revisions, a couple of specific comments/questions are listed below.

Specific Comments:

C581

Title: Hydrometeor is incorrectly spelled and videodisdrometer is two words.

Section 2: At some point in this section it would be useful to readers if you included some quantitative percent of rejected/accepted particles. This will give an idea of how inclusive your methods are.

Section 2.3.3: At the end of this section you mention statistical calculations of mean, median, and percentiles. From a statistical point of view, can you comment on whether your distributions were normal and what you hope to gain from these statistical calculations?

Interactive comment on Atmos. Meas. Tech. Discuss., 7, 1603, 2014.