

Interactive comment on “Evapotranspiration computed by Darcy’s Law: Sudan case study” by O. A. E. Abdalla

B. van den Hurk (Editor)

hurkvd@knmi.nl

Received and published: 25 November 2005

Upon reading the newly submitted manuscript I realize that the review procedure has not been optimal: only one reviewer has given valuable comments from a point of view where surface evaporation processes are dominating, and adequate expertise on groundwater dynamics is lacking. I feel that additional comments in that area are needed to judge the acceptance of this paper.

There are errors in equations, that prohibit publication: the units of m^3/s and m^2/day used in the eqs on page 9 are inconsistent.

Also, as already indicated by the reviewer, the relative contribution of 1-2 mm/yr on a water budget of 200-450 mm/yr is beyond any detection limit, and the lack of verification of the Darcy-method makes the statement that 'The Darcy method can be used in

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Print Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)

estimating the absolute groundwater loss via evapotranspiration' not convincing.

I therefore suggest to subject the paper to another review round prior to publication, and that an editor is assigned with a stronger background in groundwater modelling or observation.

Interactive comment on Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussions, 2, 1787, 2005.

Full Screen / Esc

Print Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper