

Interactive comment on “Initial assessment of a multi-model approach to spring flood forecasting in Sweden” by J. Olsson et al.

P. Crochet (Referee)

philippe@vedur.is

Received and published: 3 September 2015

Dear Jonas,

I don't have any objection against the idea of making the manuscript a Technical note, if you think that it is feasible while taking the referees's comments into consideration. In that case, you could perhaps limit the analysis to 1 river basin only. This should contribute to reduce the length of the manuscript without making it less valuable as a technical note. I would then suggest Vindelälven, both because the CP-based analog method has been optimized for that river basin and because it is unregulated. Note however that the choice of weather stations to be used in the optimization strategy of the CP-based analog method may have an influence on the method's performance.

C3451

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



This should be discussed in the technical note and evaluated more thoroughly at a later stage. Also, unless regulation is accounted for by the different methods, I don't think that you should include regulated rivers into the analysis at this point, unless you think that the impact is minimal or that you are able to describe how the regulation of Ångermanälven and Ljusnan is affecting the performance and validity of the different methods. The specific challenges and limitations associated to the application of the proposed methods to regulated rivers should be discussed anyway in the Technical note.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 6077, 2015.

HESSD

12, C3451–C3452, 2015

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3452

