

Interactive comment on “A conceptual dynamic vegetation-soil model for arid and semiarid zones” by D. I. Quevedo and F. Francés

S. Manfreda (Editor)

manfreda@unibas.it

Received and published: 28 January 2008

The paper named "*A conceptual dynamic vegetation-soil model for arid and semiarid zones*" by D.I. Quevedo and F. Frances deals with a topic of interest for scope of the special issue that we are promoting on HESS. There are elements of interest in the results of this work, but it requires **Major Revisions** according to the suggestions of both Referees and also in my personal opinion.

I want to remark the excellent work made by the referees that have provided constructive reviews to this paper that will be useful to re-organize its structure possibly improving its final quality.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



In particular, I want to remark the first comment of the referee N.1 regarding the vegetation model. Considering the available database and the model application, the study is lacking of a model validation that would be the real test to understand the reliability of the proposed vegetation-soil model.

As it is now, the manuscript is filled with grammatical errors and poorly structured sentences-to the point that they actually disrupt the manuscript's clarity and readability. I have pointed out some of them below.

The following list exemplifies my concern:

P3470: L9: "8230;, being the knowledge about soil moisture quite relevant for8230;" should read something like "8230;, with the knowledge about soil moisture being quite relevant for8230;" L13: "based in" should read "based on" (also P3473 L11) L15: "Two tanks interconnected were" should read "Two interconnected tanks were" (also P3473 L11)

P3471: L3: "8230;are complex, their properties8230;" should read "8230;are complex; their properties" L10: "plays a second role" should read "play a secondary role" L10-11: "8230;, being the availability of water the main8230;" should read "8230;, with the availability of water being the main8230;"

P3473: L17: "enters to" should read "enters" (also L20)

In the caption of figure 4 provide also the description of H_2 . I think that may be a typing error in the use of H_u , it should be H_2 .

These are some of the more obvious errors. These and others, coupled with poorly structured sentences, make the manuscript unclear and very hard to follow at many places. For example, many sentences are just too long. A good portion of Introduction lacks connection and coherence, being merely a list of things. A number of word choices do not reflect what the authors actually want to say.

I think that the topic addressed by this manuscript could potentially contribute to the

field of ecohydrology. Therefore, I would strongly encourage the authors to really take some time to get rid of all these poor features.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 4, 3469, 2007.

HESSD

4, S2111–S2113, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

S2113

