

## ***Interactive comment on “A comparison of interpolation methods on the basis of data obtained from a bathymetric survey of Lake Vrana, Croatia” by A. Šiljeg et al.***

**D. Mazvimavi (Editor)**

dmazvimavi@uwc.ac.za

Received and published: 26 May 2015

This manuscript still requires some editorial corrections before we can consider publishing it. See some of the suggested corrections in the uploaded file. The authors need to be consistent in their reference to Lake Vrana. They refer this as “Lake Vrana” and then “Vrana Lake”. The authors do not always refer to the correct Figure or Table in the text. For example on Page 4 they refer to Fig 13 in line 5 before other Figures such as Figure 1 onwards have been referred to. This gives the impression that this statement was in another document/report. On Page 5, Prosika gauge is referred to before an explanation has been given about where this gauge is, and what it is used

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



for. Readers cannot understand the reasons for referring to Prosika gauge. On Page 5 and 6, the authors provide under “3.1 Plan for the Bathymetric Survey”. This text is not necessary since in all studies such planning is done. The authors need to justify the use of 14 interpolation methods. Could they not select a few even a single a) deterministic, and b) geostatistical methods to compare? Readers have difficulties in understanding why 14 methods were compared. This issue was raised by the Reviewers. Table titles and captions of Figures should be self-explanatory. Titles for Table 2 and 4 should be improved. Each figure should have a clear legend, e.g. Figure 7, 8, 10. On Page 22 to 23 the authors discuss habitats occurring in Lake Vrana. The relevance of this discussion to interpolation is not clear. The authors are discussing how the changes in water levels affect habitats. What is the relevance of the Jasen pump stopping working? There are several other corrections which I have suggested. See the uploaded file. This paper is rather too long. There is a potential to reduce the Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. The current length of the paper seems to be appropriate for a Technical Report and not a scientific paper.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/11/C6873/2015/hessd-11-C6873-2015-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 11, 13931, 2014.

## HESSD

11, C6873–C6874, 2015

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C6874

