

## ***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 #2**

Received and published: 14 January 2014

The authors proposed a multiple-assessment-point PMA (MAP-PMA) framework for control NPS pollution. The authors have done significant amount of work in the paper. The application of this framework is useful and interesting. The paper is well written, easily understandable and could be published with minor revisions.

I have a few specific suggestions and comments, including:

1. How to define a watershed “large scale” or not?

C7276

2. If the pollutant is controlled at the upstream, the self-purification capacity of the downstream river is not fully used. By considering this view, how do the authors explain the advantages and disadvantages of MAP-PMA?

3. For the traditional researches of NPS pollution, priority sources areas (PSAs) identification is often documented. How do the authors compare which is more useful in real practices, MPAs or PSAs?

4. The example of Daning River Watershed should be mentioned in the abstract.

Also there are some technical corrections.

Line 27, add the word “management” after “watershed”.

Line 37, add the word “management” after “watershed”.

Line 41, add the word “management” after “watershed”.

Lines 41-43, the reason were not clearly stated.

Line 73, central part or north-east part?

Line 86, is eutrophication also a problem of your study area?

Line 121, add the word “River” after “Daning”.

Line 135, add “of China” after “standard”.

Line 153, explain “31.54”.

Line 179, delete “changed to”.

Lines 188, write as “. . .2000-2009. . .” to consist with Line 197.

Lines 192-193, write as “. . ., 70-80

Table 1, uniform the format of percent sign.