

Interactive comment on “Synthetic Weather Diaries: Concept and Application to Swiss Weather in 1816” by Stefan Brönnimann

Stefan Brönnimann

stefan.broennimann@giub.unibe.ch

Received and published: 5 August 2020

Thank you very much for the review. I will change the sentence on l. 188 to "twice or three times daily instrumental measurements (pressure, temperature) and non-instrumental observations (whether or not there was precipitation, sky cover)".

Thank you also for your question on the disagreement in July 1865. In fact, from 8 to 31 July, there were no observations, so the plot is misleading and in the revised paper I will mark this period in grey (it is the only missing period in that year). The corrected Figure is attached as Fig. 1. A sentence is also added to the paper.

Line 284-287: I have prepared the figure also for the years 1864 and 1866, which were closer to average in terms of precipitation. The figure is attached to this review as

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Figure 2. Results are very similar as for the dry year (except perhaps for the summer of 1866, which appears to be slightly worse). The figure will be added to the paper as a supplementary figure and a sentence of discussion will be added.

Interactive comment on Clim. Past Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/cp-2020-74>, 2020.

CPD

Interactive
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper






Fig. 1. Synthetic diary and observations with respect to precipitation for Winterthur, 1865 (grey = no observations)

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




Fig. 2. Synthetic diary and observations with respect to precipitation for Winterthur, 1864 and 1866 (grey = no observations)

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