

Interactive comment on “Post-processing of seasonal predictions – Case studies using the EUROSIP hindcast data base” by Emmanuel Roulin and Stéphane Vannitsem

Daniel S. Wilks (Editor)

dsw5@cornell.edu

Received and published: 1 October 2020

I think the paper still has serious problems, and is not acceptable in current form. Most problematic is the selective presentation of results, for (one assumes) only seasons that show best results. No attempt has been made to account for multiple testing in evaluation of the “significant” results among many evaluations, even for the presented results. This is so even though the Wilks (2016) False Discovery Rate paper is cited in the introduction on page 3. This concern was also voiced by Reviewer 2 of the original submission. Consequently, meaningful forecast skill has been demonstrated.

Interactive
comment

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

