

Interactive comment on “Assessment of the indirect calibration of a rainfall-runoff model for ungauged catchments in Flanders” by N. De Vleeschouwer and V. R. N. Pauwels

v. nourani (Referee)

vnourani@yahoo.com

Received and published: 18 February 2013

Although there is not any novelty in the paper, it may be accepted after major revision. The authors should describe the methodology and outcomes more clearly. Many main topics have been left without answers. Some general comments are as follows: 1-The literature review is weak. The author should present a complete literature review in the paper. 2- Present references for all Eqs. 3- Page 112 line 5, why the authors select these values? More description is needed. 4- Eqs 13 and 14 both have same meaning, why we do not use only one of them? 5- Page 115, line 22, again the authors did not present clear explanation for the selected parameters. Is the case study and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



problem similar to the presented citation of Pauwels and DeLannoy 2011)? 6- The authors should summarize the results in Tables, e.g., present Table instead of Figs 3,5,7 7- Figs 4,6,7,9,10 should be sent in large size with better quality and higher resolution. 8- Check English, e.g., page 120, line 21 “experiments 2 and 3” or page 121, line 14 “coefficients”... 9- For Fig 2, present legend, improve the quality. 10- Most of presented conclusions are already clear for hydrologists, e.g., page 122, lines 10-25

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 103, 2013.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

