

## ***Interactive comment on “The inbuilt long-term unfeasibility of environmental flows when disregarding riparian vegetation requirements” by R. Rivaes et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #3**

Received and published: 12 February 2016

hess-2015-223: The inbuilt long-term unfeasibility of environmental flows when disregarding riparian vegetation requirements

Comments to the authors

The authors discuss the importance of considering the requirements of riparian plants in the development of environmental flow regimes. The topic is timely and relevant. However, I have a couple of reservations about the overall quality of the article and particularly the language used. I think a careful consideration of terminology, considerable tightening and thorough avoidance of redundancies will improve clarity and consistency. At the moment these structural and linguistic problems interrupt the reading

C6700

flow and distract from a potentially interesting story. Please find my specific comments and suggestions below.

Language used: The manuscript should be thoroughly tightened and edited by a native English speaker for grammatical/ linguistic issues. Especially parts of the introduction and discussion and many of the figure captions are hard to understand, even for a person familiar with the topic. There is generally a tendency for very long sentences and for combining multiple words into a single term. A few examples – there are many more:

- Figure 2: Fish (..) and riparian (...) addressed environmental flow regime considered for the habitat modelling.
- Figure 5: Fish weighted usable areas
- Figure 1: the study site mean daily discharge
- monster-sentence in line 23 ff., page 1

Redundancies: The introduction is lengthy. Much of the info presented does not seem to be relevant for the story to be told (e.g. detailed description of the e-flow history). There are considerable redundancies, sometimes even within one sentence (again sentence on line 23 ff., page 1). Furthermore, there is no need in listing all literature references that might be of relevance (page 2, line 18ff.). In my opinion, the intro could be reduced at least to half of its present length.

Abstract = introduction?: The abstract doesn't really give a summary of the work, but rather presents an overview of the aims of the study. Results remain completely unmentioned or just vaguely indicated (“we demonstrated...”). The abstract should be a teaser/ eye-catcher attracting potential readers. In the present form, this is not the case. As a reader I'd like to see numbers and clear messages here.

Figures and captions: Figures and captions are not stand-alone. In some figures, the chosen graphical representation seems inappropriate. Some examples:

C6701

- Figure 1: Norway and Switzerland are indicated as EU countries. . .
- In Figure 2 you explain twice and in a different way what the black line stands for – this is confusing for the reader.
- Figure 3: “the considered flow regimes”. . . which are?
- Figure 4: What’s the p-level? What do you mean by “value range” – max/ min? For depth this doesn’t tell much, as the three boxes look completely the same, but still you mention significant differences. . . I do not understand what you indicate by the letters a/b. . .

Title: The title is long, rather vague (what do you mean by “unfeasibility”? why “inbuilt”?) and awkward.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 10701, 2015.