

# ***Interactive comment on “Upstream to downstream: a multiple-assessment-point approach for targeting non-point-source priority management areas at large watershed scale” by L. Chen et al.***

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 13 January 2014

The authors described a multiple-assessment-point approach for targeting non-point-source priority management areas at large watershed scale. The results could provide some useful information on more cost-effective allocation of PMAs. This manuscript was well written and worth being published in Hydrology and Earth System Sciences, but some points should be better presented/discussed before publication:

1. Part of references cited in your manuscript is too old to illuminate your viewpoint, such as Page 14538, line 2; Page 14540, line 20; Page 14544, line 28, etc. It is better

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



to refer the latest literature in you references.

2. Please reorganize the description of PMA data in Results and Discussion section, according to your figure. Parts of them are hard to be read clearly!
3. Page 14547, line 1-9: Please move this paragraph to Results and Discussion section, and try to discuss the influences of water quality monitoring stations on your MAP-PMA framework calculation based on other related references.
4. Please conclude the advantages of MAP-PMA framework based on your data obtained from the Daning river watershed.
5. Try to adapt statistical method to analyze the difference between the MAP-PMA and traditional targeting approach.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 14535, 2013.

## HESD

10, C7227–C7228, 2014

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

