

Interactive comment on “Effects of ecological factors and human activities on nonpoint source pollution in the upper reach of the Yangtze River and its management strategies” by X. W. Ding et al.

X. W. Ding et al.

binger2000dxw@163.com

Received and published: 7 March 2014

Dear discussant who gave the comments, Thank you very much for your comments and suggestions. As you mentioned, the effects of ecological and human activities on the loading of nonpoint source pollution is a hotspot and difficulty issue in the field of watershed integrated management, especially for large scale basin. We developed the improved export coefficient model as well as the revised universal soil loss equation model, and used them to simulate nonpoint source pollutant transport in the upper

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

reach of the largest basin in China. Thank you for approving the importance and original contribution of this work, and we also expect that it become a useful tool of nonpoint source pollution modeling studies and water resources management. We agree that there still have some expressions need to be improved in this article and we will correct them in the revised version. The corrections will include the following. (1) Some of the typos and grammatical errors will be corrected. For example, in page 3, line 10, “contributors” will be revised as “contributions”. For another example, in page 3 and page 4, past tense verbs will be used for literature review. (2) “Introduction” section: The methods previously used for examining the impacts of ecological and human factors on watershed nonpoint source pollution will be reviewed. The improved export coefficient model and the revised universal soil loss equation model are the main tools used in this study, so a brief review on their applications for investigating nonpoint source pollution will be added. (3) “Materials and methods” section: We admit that the same symbols were used in different equations to represent different parameters and had different units. The reason is that the improved export coefficient model is based on export coefficient model which was proposed in 1996 by Johns and the revised universal soil loss equation model is based on universal soil loss equation model which was proposed in 1997 by Renard et al. The researchers used the same symbols in different models to represent different parameters and had different units. So we had to follow the expressions to further develop their previous researches. (4) “2.3 Data collection and preparation” section: The description of how to obtain the data or empirical equations of modeling parameters was presented in other two articles (Ding et al., 2010 & Shen et al., 2013) which was list in the reference, therefore we didn’t want to stress it again in this article. (5) “Results and discussion”: We will discuss the advantage and disadvantage of the proposed models so that the extension of this work to other watersheds can be understood. (6) “Conclusions”: We will condense this section and make it compact. Thanks again for your good suggestions and hope to discuss the following version or some other topics concerning nonpoint source pollution with you. Thank you again for your time.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 11, 691, 2014.

HESD

11, C333–C335, 2014

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C335

