

Interactive comment on “Understanding flood regime changes in Europe: a state of the art assessment” by J. Hall et al.

J. Hall et al.

hall@hydro.tuwien.ac.at

Received and published: 6 February 2014

We would like to thank the reviewer for providing his/her opinion on the review article. Unfortunately, the basic premise on which the reviewer's comments hinge is inaccurate. The first sentence of the reviewer's comment states "The main attempt of the work presented in this manuscript is to improve the understanding of flood regime changes in Europe."

Actually, that is not the case. Rather, the original manuscript clearly states "The purpose of this paper is to review the current understanding of flood regime changes of European rivers, in particular whether changes have been observed in the past, the

C7773

drivers of change, what changes are likely to be expected in the future and the current methods used." (p. 15529).

In other words, the aim of the paper is to REVIEW the current understanding, rather than "to IMPROVE the understanding", as implied by the reviewer (p. C7757).

The HESS submission guidelines state "Review Articles summarise the status of knowledge and outline future directions of research within the journal scope." (http://www.hydrology-and-earth-system-sciences.net/submission/manuscript_types.html). This is indeed what the paper attempts to achieve.

The identification of the paper type as a review has been stressed in the initial submission in the following manners: 1) by choosing the wording "state of the art assessment" in the title; 2) by indicating the category "review" in the paper type on submission; 3) by clearly stating in the aim of the paper ("The purpose of this paper is to REVIEW the current understanding ...") (p. 15529).

The reviewer further notes "Large portion of section 2 provides the review of methods ..." (p. C7758). Indeed, this is the purpose of a review paper.

The nature of a review paper is that it does not go beyond what has been published in the literature (rather it provides order to the existing literature), yet this seems to be the main criticism of this reviewer.

The reviewer seems to evaluate our manuscript as if it were a "research article". However, this is not a research article and never claimed to be one, as noted above.

Finally, the reviewer suggests "Section 4 of the manuscript is clearly indicating that the material presented in the manuscript is much closer to a research proposal than the journal article." (p. C7759).

To this, we refer the reviewer to the HESS submission guidelines for reviews. These are very clear in that review articles are to "outline future directions of research within

C7774

the journal scope". This is exactly what section 4 does.

In case the reviewer believes that the readers will struggle to understand that this is a review paper rather than a research article, we would be happy to make a clearer statement in the manuscript that this is a review paper to avoid misunderstandings, and would appreciate any guidance on how to do this.

In summary, while we appreciate the reviewer's concerns in the review, we are afraid that the point that this is a review paper has been missed. We therefore would appreciate further comments and insights bearing in mind that this is a review paper.

The reviewer's statement regarding the review of scenarios used to predict future changes in floods in section 3 will be addressed at a later stage together with other reviews and comments received.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 15525, 2013.