

Interactive comment on “HESS Opinions: Advocating process modeling and de-emphasizing parameter estimation” by A. Bahremand

A. Bahremand

abdolreza.bahreman@yahoo.com

Received and published: 5 February 2016

Dear Prof. Zehe,

I would like to thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to rework the manuscript according to the reviewers' and editor's comments. Your interactive editor comment is very precious for me, as it contains very important guiding points in line with the reviewers' comments and my own interests (e.g. more physics), and it is supportive and encouraging. I really appreciate it.

This letter is not my formal response to the editor and the reviewers, that will come at the end of the given time for revision of the manuscript, so this is just a short note to say that I will do my best to include all the received comments because I found all of

C6635

them important and very helpful to improve this work.

I would just like to add something here (it is implicitly in the manuscript already):

We all should focus on reaching one model. To reach that one model we must give the priority to "better physics" then comes "better results". Therefore, when REW modeling has better physics, one should not worry about the results and the feasibility at this current moment. Surely the better results will come later after we focus "our intellectual power" on the one model instead of 100 models (I am referring to your last comment which I really liked it). We are wasting time by working on so many models. I hope if ever hydrologists decided to go for a universal model let's say the model of everywhere (described in Beven's papers, 2007 and 2012) or the community hydrological model (Weiler and Beven, 2015WRR), then, from the beginning they should see it as a model which is going to consider and close all balances (mass, energy and momentum) finally. I am not familiar with or better say I have not worked with this energy-centered models but through your opinion paper (Zehe et al., 2014HESS) and some previous works (e.g., Beven, 2006HESS, Reggiani et al., 1998 and 1999WRR), I am convinced that is where hydrological modeling should go.

Thank you very much,

Best regards,

Abdolreza Bahremand

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 12377, 2015.

C6636