

Interactive comment on “Water management in the Senegal River Delta: a continuing uncertainty” by M. Mietton et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 8 January 2008

This paper presents an overview of water resources management problems in the Senegal river basin, with a focus on recent issues in the delta. The main problem with this paper comes from the fact that it is purely descriptive; no method, concept nor scientific tools are discussed. The reviewer feels that this paper does not fit in HESS as it does not present fundamental nor applied research findings.

1) Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of HESS? No. This paper does not really address scientific questions. It provides an overview (and history) of water resources planning and management practices in the Senegal river basin. Some impacts resulting from development decisions are discussed but there is no overall analysis of what appears to be a persistent gap between planned and

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

realized performances. It seems as if water managers in the Senegal river are providing short-term responses to long-term problems, therefore creating new problems. The persistence of such planning practices deserves a thoroughful analysis.

- 2) Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? No. See above
- 3) Are substantial conclusions reached? Conclusions are in line with the manuscript.
- 4) Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? No scientific methods nor assumptions are presented in this paper.
- 5) Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? The conclusions summarize the observations given in the manuscript.
- 6) Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Not relevant
- 7) Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? Yes
- 8) Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes
- 9) Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary? Yes but it is not self-supportive as we need to read the rest of the manuscript to understand it
- 10) Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes
- 11) Is the language fluent and precise? Some minor problems: - the generating capacity of a power plant cannot be expressed in GWh but in GW. GWh = energy not capacity (page 4301, line 8). - replace 1000 m⁴/s by 1000 m³/s - the authors use their own definition of “ risk ”, which is neither the engineering nor the financial definition (page 4298, line 25)
- 12) Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? Not relevant

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

13) Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated? No

14) Are the number and quality of references appropriate? Yes

15) Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? Yes

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 4, 4297, 2007.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper