

# ***Interactive comment on “The weather behind the words. New methodologies for integrated hydrometeorological reconstruction through documentary sources” by Salvador Gil-Guirado et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 6 March 2019

1. Overall comment This paper is very interesting and brings a new insight on methodological approaches of historical climate reconstructions based on documentary data. The authors apply a new method of hydrometeorological reconstruction and attempt its validation by applying it simultaneously with other two already known methods. The manuscript is well designed and properly supported on up to date bibliography. However, this version exhibits some problems that must be overcome, and some questions should be attentively considered in order to improve the quality and robustness of the work.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Main comments 1) As the most innovative contribution of this paper is the method named “COST”, some important details are missing in its description. For instance, along the study period (1600-1900) the “Actas Capitulares” (AC) of the city council have maintained the same model, that means, the same periodicity, structure and general dimension? If the answer is positive, so clarify by stating it. Note that a single example of AC is shown but the reader has no information if this sample is valid over the three centuries. Does the frequency of the council meetings is satisfactorily suitable to permit the data collection with monthly resolution? The authors only mention the total number of consulted sheets of paper but did not make any reference to the number of books and municipal chapter acts and it’s interannual distribution. In my opinion this must be clearly justified, because it concerns the consistency of the study. 2) Regarding the methodology, there are several important details that should be clearly stated in the text instead of being included in the tables and figures captions. The reading and comprehension of paper is diffculted by this fact, in my opinion. I suggest an improvement of section 3, providing a more clear and detailed description of all methodological procedures undertaken through the study. 3) There are some important problems detected in Figures as follows: a) Title of Figure 7 (drought variability) is not suitable e should be modified according the Figure 8 title (extreme rainfall variability). b) Figure 9 is not legible and must be resized.

Minor comments. 1) The text needs a general revision of the English. There are several unclear expressions, some mistakes and missing words. I suggest a general revision of the text redaction. 2) The titles of sections 2 and 3 should be modified because the authors should point out the sources and methods used in their own study and not in such general mode as “Sources in Historical Climatology”. In my opinion this is incorrect. 3) The final section must be a “Conclusion” instead of “Results” (repeated section title).

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://www.clim-past-discuss.net/cp-2019-1/cp-2019-1-RC2-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2019-1>, 2019.

**CPD**

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

