

Interactive comment on “Stochastic approach to analyzing the uncertainties and possible changes in the availability of water in the future based on a climate change scenario” by G. G. Oliveira et al.

J. Mutemi (Referee)

jnmutemi@yahoo.co.uk

Received and published: 11 May 2015

Look at following Pages to notice implied corrective suggestion

Pg: 3788: gases which have implications on thermal energy

Pg.3789: 5-10: IPCC (2013, 2014), current global climate is warmer than pre-industrial period Shown be increasing trend of surface temperatures of the earth

Negative impacts Which makes them attractive in simulation

Of the physical climate system

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

Pg 3790: 10-20: It is better to drive the Eta model with HadCM model RCP scenarios like 4.5, 8.5 or 2.6 rather than the scenario A1B which might be obsolete currently.

Pg.3793 daily climate data should actually be daily weather observations. Pg.3793 annual rainfall is 1750mm which occurs within 115days during the year.

Pg3807 to Pg 3817

Results and discussion should be improved to attract readers For example Section 3 Results and discussion The first statement “ This item will . . . ” Re-write as “This section . . . ”

It is not ideal to have sub-sections in discussion with sub-titles like “Analysis.”, e.g. “3.1 Analysis of stochastic . . . ” Change to “3.1 Monthly flows”. “3.2 Analysis of changes and uncertainties . . . ” Change to “3.2 Changes and Uncertainties . . . ”

The discussion is heavy and there is intensive use of "single precision real numbers" and even percentages to decimal point. So many numerical values in article make it non-attractive. Avoid numerics as far as possible and bring out the key points narratively. There are good Figures and tables in the manuscript, but in most cases, diagram Figure and/or table are referred by simply brackets (Examples Pg 3808 Line 2 ".....discharge (Fig.3), Pg.3817 Line 14higher (Fig.15)". Same applies to tables e.g. Pg 3808 Line 9 "...0.52% (Table 2)."). This tends to suggest that the figures and tables are not relevant. Figures and tables are for purpose of strengthening the main points and there should be statements like "Figure 3 illustrates volume discharged in ... This result there reveals that".

I recommend re-writing of this section with inclusion of statements like above, with avoidance of numerics. Graphs and tables can be referred to directly within the discussion to improve the attractiveness of the article.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 3787, 2015.