

Interactive comment on “Comment on “A hybrid model of self organizing maps and least square support vector machine for river flow forecasting” by Ismail et al. (2012)” by F. Fahimi and A. H. El-Shafie

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 15 April 2014

The authors present clear points of discussion related to the original work “A hybrid model of self organizing maps and least square support vector machine for river flow forecasting”. The comments are well justified and point to important clarifications. However, it is not clear for me this as a publication. The comment seems not help to a scientific development or a contribution that will extend, complement or either improves the research findings. I believe that the updates and clarifications introduce in this comment to the original paper are oriented to mistakes which some of them were already expressed in previous reviews. In general, it is worth noticing the small problems that

C8401

the publication has, but this does not contribute or add to the theory, the case study conclusions or methodology presented in the original publication.

Concrete comments are:

Point 1 (page 1392, line 4) This is a mistake in the original paper, which is not a scientific contribution but more a clarification on the way the figure is placed in the context of other charts.

Point 2 (page 1392, line 10) This was already addressed by the first reviews of the original paper and it was clearly mentioned by the reviewer that if size increases the number of samples in each cluster will be less, in fact the actual result on a SOM of 5x5 shows to have some cluster that might have zero, one or two samples in training and in validation. So theory of the methodology is limited by the case study. It was recommended in the original publication to explain this and highlight the limitation.

Point 3 (page 1392, line 20) This statement indeed shows a mistake in the original paper which will help to improve the readability but does not contribute to the theory, case study or overall methodology presented.

Despite the fact that I agree with the comments, and that they are important for the quality of the journal, I do not believe this comments as they are can be a valuable contribution as an independent article.

In order to see it as an article I believe this comments should contribute to the theory of the methodology presented, either on a detailed analysis of one of the important procedures in the model or on the conclusion or other research process that extends or complements the original publication.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 13889, 2013.

C8402