

***Interactive comment on* “Stream restoration and sanitary infrastructure alter sources and fluxes of water, carbon, and nutrients in urban watersheds” by M. J. Pennino et al.**

A. Butturini (Editor)

abutturini@ub.edu

Received and published: 7 April 2016

Dear authors, I finally got the reviewer suggestions and comments. I can consider finished this phase of the review process. Reviewers had good work and I appreciate their effort and constructive analysis that will help the authors to improve their manuscript. Overall they considered the manuscript a potentially interesting paper for HESS. However, the publication of the manuscript in its present form is not recommended, and a major revision is being requested. I really suggest to consider in detail the general, specific, technical and terminology reviewer’s suggestions/comments. A special attention should be paid on: To context your specific case study into a more broad context

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Reviewer #1 suggest to adopt a different approach to compare restored vs. unrestored streams. Both reviewers outlined on the need to clarify the terminology The discussion should be less speculative and need a more clear connection between results and conclusions

In your reply, it is essential to explaining how and where each point of the Reviewers' comments has been addressed. Should you disagree with any part of the reviews, please explain why.

Best regards, Andrea Butturini

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 13149, 2015.

HESSD

12, C7041–C7042, 2016

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C7042

