

***Interactive comment on* “The co-production of a “relevant” expertise – administrative and scientific cooperation in the French water policies elaboration and implementation” by J. F. Deroubaix**

**S. Barles (Editor)**

sabine.barles@univ-paris8.fr

Received and published: 21 December 2007

Two reviews of the manuscript have now been achieved and published as "Referee Comments" in HESSD. I hereby acknowledge the authors of reviews for their work and valuable appreciation. They agree in finding this paper interesting, despite some weak points. Based on these evaluations and my own reading of the manuscript, the latter is accepted for publication in the special issue "Man and river systems: Long term interactions between societies and nature in regional scale watersheds" of HESS with

major changes.

The author is asked to write an "Author Comment" within 4 weeks to respond to the referee comments and attributed short comments, and to submit a revised version of the manuscript accordingly. In doing so, he shall address each point of the referee comments and provide a list of the changes introduced to the manuscript.

In addition to the minor demands from referees that should be answered and lead to some precisions in the manuscript, the following points should be addressed:

- the bibliographical background is not strong enough: see for instance R#3 about modes of public action - and the same could be argued for various aspects of the paper that is not strongly enough connected to the scientific context (for instance about integrated management); in addition, it would have been interesting to refer to other case studies and other authors in the field of water management in order to compare the results (in conclusion for instance).

- generally the paper is too much affirmative and not enough demonstrative; as a result it is from time to time unclear (see both R#1 and R#3) or not scientifically convincing (R#1). The empirical material should be used in order to better demonstrate the affirmations. That means that the paper should be extended (around 50%) in order to give the full scientific argument and demonstration together with their empirical evidences (remembering also that HESS is an international journal). I just take as an example pages 3777 and 3778:

– "the researches conducted aimed at understanding the relations between the environmental elements and the induced risks rather than elaborate environmental protection strategies." What were those researches? What size? What aim? Etc. This contextualisation seems important too better understand the author's point.

– "The first significant characteristic of this intellectual community is therefore that all its members shared a strongly structured definition of the environment. The environment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

being studied was and had to be human centred." This is interesting, but what does prove this? How is it expressed by the researchers themselves? Is it implicit or explicit?

– "This is even more important as the second characteristic of this network was that its members viewed the research as the result of the meeting of a social demand and a supply of science." Be more explicit. How was it expressed? How did the hiatus between this point of view and the previous one express? Was it controversial? Etc.

– What was the purpose of the research program on wetlands? What was the problem with wetlands?

– The two councils: why two, was it a new way of management, how were they supposed to work and how did they, why did their composition differ from the theoretical one? What does it demonstrate?

– Types of knowledge more founded than others: why? What does it reflect regarding the topic of the paper?

– Why is modelling a consequence of prescriptive dimension? Isn't it possible to have a prescriptive approach without modelling (my answer should be yes).

- Conclusion: As case studies are not clear and well-argued enough, they don't scientifically justify the conclusions. In addition, the absence of definition "integrated management" (even smooth or carefully exposed) at the beginning of the paper is quite embarrassing, all the more so since "integrated expertise" is defined in the conclusion.

- Specific remarks: English should be improved, and in particular the choice of tense (please use preterit or other past tense for past facts, events and discussions).

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 4, 3771, 2007.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper