

Comments on the manuscript “Anomalous holiday precipitation over southern China” by Zhang et al. (2018)

I am glad that the authors accepted my previous advice and revised the manuscript accordingly to some degree. I am fully satisfied with the scientific findings presented. However, I still cannot recommend its publication at this phase. There are two major issues.

First, since the authors no longer attributed precipitation changes to aerosol loading changes, why did they take so much space to talk about aerosol changes during the CSF? The rationales should be given clearly to avoid confusing or misleading readers. Currently, that part seems quite irrelevant to the major topic, especially for the Abstract part.

Second, the authors should spend some time on the English writing in the next version. The manuscript now is too verbose, informal and sometimes confusing or misleading, and has many grammar errors. Below, I list a few examples and hope the authors can check and revise the whole manuscript accordingly.

1. What’s the relationship between Chinese Spring Festival (CSF), CSF holiday and Lunar New Year’s Day? It could be clear for Chinese readers, but not necessarily for readers from other cultures. The authors should explain it clearly at the beginning of the Abstract, or readers may have difficulties understanding results below.

2. In ‘this manuscript reports that during the holidayshas been significantly reduced’, I think ‘holidays’ should be replaced with ‘holiday’; ‘significantly reduced’ compared with what period? A better statement could be ‘the precipitation during the CSF holiday over southern China tends to be lower than days before and after the holiday’.

3. The authors has a mixed use of present and past tenses in describing their results, such as ‘the Δ RH showed an evident’, ‘the Δ RH vertical profiles displays ...’, ‘low cloud cover decreased ...’, ‘LCC also shows a...’ They had better stick to one throughout the manuscript.

4. When citing papers, the authors also should pay attention to proper and consistent use of tenses. For example, Page 3, line 3: ‘PM2.5 in Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei were reduced’ vs. Page 3, line 19: ‘there are significant negative ...’ Both are observational results published in previous studies, why use different tenses?

4. Page 2, line 6-9, the two adjacent sentences both start with ‘Recent’. Better use a different transition word.

5. Page 1, line 20 ‘there are also discernible weekly cycles’ in what aspect?

6. Page 2, line 20-25, these sentences are too verbose. They can be shortened as ‘there are also discernible weekly cycles in meteorological parameters. For example, Gong et al. (2007) found that there are robust weekly co-variations in the surface solar radiation, total cloud cover,

maximum temperature, and relative humidity in China, where the weekdays tend to have lower total cloud cover and relative humidity but higher surface solar radiation and temperature than the weekends'. Try to condense your words.

7. Page 2, line 26, 'Choi et al. (2008) found that the summertime cloudiness shows a bell-shaped curve between midweek and weekend'. This sentence is confusing. What parameter shows the bell shape in what way? I checked the paper, where the bell-shaped curve referred to interdecadal variations. I could not get this information or even got wrong information from the authors' saying.

8. Page 3, line 7: 'for example, on' → such as

9. Page 3, line 10: 'The emission may differ among these events' differ in what aspect? The sentence tells me nothing.

10. Remove all 'etc.' from the manuscript. It is too informal for a scientific paper.

11. Page 4, the last line, 'Lunar New Year's Days (LNYD)', LNYD→LNYDs; replace all 'New Year's Day' afterward with 'LNYD'

12. Page 5, line 14, everyday → every day.

13. Page 5, line 17, 'whose lunar date is' → 'whose lunar dates are'; 'and calculated the average' grammar error

13. Page 16, line 6, this sentence should go into the introduction section.

I could not check errors and verbose sentences throughout the paper and do not ensure no other errors in places between what I list above. The authors should do it and revise the manuscript accordingly.