

Interactive comment on “Analysis of effective resistance calculation methods and their effect on modelling evapotranspiration in two different patches of vegetation in semi-arid SE Spain” by A. Were et al.

H. Vereecken (Editor)

h.vereecken@fz-juelich.de

Received and published: 13 June 2007

General comments

Two referees were asked for reviews and have provided valuable information on how to improve the manuscript. They voted "accept after major revision" (referee 1) and "accept after minor revision" (referee 2). At least one central point of concern of both referees, i.e. the size of the herbaceous plot, was identified as caused by a typographic error by the authors. Suggestions how to improve the paper with regard to other con-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

cerns of the referees have been made by the authors.

Based on these evaluations, I encourage the authors to submit a revised manuscript taking into account the referee's comments.

However, due to the fact that some comments and especially one referee's first comment came very late, no interactive discussion could develop during the open discussion phase. The referees did not have the possibility to articulate whether they are satisfied with the author's replies or not. Therefore, I will reserve the possibility to contact the present or new referees the way it is described in paragraph 8 of the evaluation section of the HESS/HESSD homepage.

Below, some hints are given on whether the author's replies seem to satisfy the referee's comments from my point of view. The ability of the revised manuscript to respect these hints will be the basis of my decision whether to seek additional referee assistance.

Referee 1

General comment: The authors consider their approach to differ too much in its objective (especially, scale) from the work mentioned by the referee. However, they did not comment on the question if and why the proposed methods are not applicable to the paper's objective. It is recommended that the authors give a statement to this question in another author's comment. Even if the proposed additional methods turn out to be worthless for the paper's objective, the authors should embed their own work in the wider literature context in the introduction or theory section, briefly discussing the similarities and differences in objective as done in their reply. They are encouraged to add further examples with respect to the referee's mentioning "amongst others".

Specific comment 1: See referee 2, general comment and specific comment 5

Specific comment 2: As the measurements cannot be easily repeated and the referee's concern is not of a too great significance for the overall quality of the work as long as

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

all other concerns are met, I will not insist on improvements related to this comment.

Specific comment 3: An improved (as short and clear as possible) version of the author's reply should become part of the revised manuscript's methods section.

Referee 2

General comment and specific comment 5: The Referee specified dimensions of 100 m x 100 m (as are the real dimension of the plot after typo error correction) as an absolute minimum requirement. In fact, measurements at a height of 2.5 m might still be affected by outside vegetation considerably. For certain, the (rare) wind directions with 20 m fetch will not yield representative results. As this kind of quality control can easily be done on the existent dataset, it is still strongly recommended to add either footprint modeling or wind-direction filtering to the work.

Specific comment 1: No editor comment required.

Specific comment 3: No editor comment required.

Specific comment 4: The term can either be replaced (as suggested by the authors), or be kept (if a short explanation with citations similar to the one in the author's reply is added to the manuscript).

Specific comment 5: See above.

Specific comment 6, 7, 8: The author's suggestions are accepted. However, R^2 and slope should not be eliminated completely as readers might want to know them.

Technical comments: No editor comment required.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 4, 243, 2007.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper