

Interactive comment on “Comparative assessment of predictions in ungauged basins – Part 3: Runoff signatures in Austria” by A. Viglione et al.

HHG Savenije (Editor)

h.h.g.savenije@tudelft.nl

Received and published: 12 March 2013

Dear Authors,

It is clear from the discussion that the referees appreciate your paper and consider it an important contribution to the literature, but at the same time they all agree that it requires major revision.

Referee#1 would like you to discuss the implication of what you have found and to distill lessons from your results. In a sense, this is also what referee#5 emphasizes. If top-kriging performs better than regionalization of HBV parameters, then please discuss the implications of this. Is this a generic conclusion (statistical methods outperform conceptual models) or does it depend on the model structure, climatic variability, etc.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Referees #2, #3 and #4 stress that the paper is rather superficial and biased to the authors own work. It is important to highlight what's new in your paper. Referee#4 stresses that the structure of the paper leaves much to be desired.

I agree with the referees that this is an important paper, but a lot has to be done to bring this paper to the same level as the companion papers. I am sure you will be eager to do this, but before you start working on the revision, I would like you to reply to the comments and to realize that HESSD is a discussion forum and not just a collection of reviews and rebuttals.

I suggest you wait with the submission of your final paper until you have given the referees the opportunity to react to your replies.

Sincerely, Hubert Savenije

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 449, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

