

Interactive comment on “Trends and future challenges of water resources in the Tigris–Euphrates Rivers basin in Iraq” by I. E. Issa et al.

I. E. Issa et al.

nadhir.alansari@ltu.se

Received and published: 22 January 2014

Referee #1 Dear Referee number 1 Thank you very much for your comments. We feel that your comments gave a new perspective to our work and we did some changes in the text to fulfill the points highlighted. Now we think the paper is much better.

This manuscript focuses on the evaluation of the reality of the current situation and future challenges of water availability and demand in Iraq. This topic is attractive and important. However, there are two main concerns. First, the innovation and specialization of this study is not clearly. Since there have been some similar researches in

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

the Tigris–Euphrates Rivers Basin, it is important to prove the specialization and importance of this study clearly, and explain how this study could make distinctive means to future researches or management. Second, the method and results are not rigorous enough. Substantial revision is required before consideration for possible publication.

Some specific comments are as follows.

As far as the specific points you mentioned, please note: 1. Page14618-14620. In the abstract and introduction parts, the author explained the necessity to know the water resources trends by listing a series of conventional work. But the difference of the present study and those conventional studies is not explained. The innovations of the case (Iraq) or the new method could be expressed with more words This comparison was done. 2. Page 14620. The introduction for the study area might be too much. We have cancelled few things in the introduction of the study area. 3. Page 14624. Compared with the Section 2 (study area), the Section 3 (data and methodology used) did not provide enough information on the method, especially the generation of the trend lines. Since it is a new method, some details of it will be helpful for readers to understand it. We have explained the technique used. 4. The results part (Section 4) seems a little simple. It looks like a simple description of the tables and figures. The authors could consider adding more discussions on the natural and social reasons of the water trends and the advices for future management. We added more details in this section. 5. Page14625. The method used to compute the water demand is imprecise and does not consider the precipitation and evaporation. The authors should prove its rationality. The precipitation and evaporation are indirectly included. This is so when you compare the discharges of two successive stations on the same river, then all these variables are considered. We have explained his in the text.

Thank you again. Best regards.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/10/C7364/2014/hessd-10-C7364-2014->



Interactive
Comment

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

