

Interactive comment on “Probability distribution of flood flows in Tunisia” by H. Abida and M. Ellouze

M. Mikos (Editor)

mmikos@fgg.uni-lj.si

Received and published: 24 June 2007

Anonymous Referee 2 wrote in an email to the editor:

1) Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of HESS? Yes.
2) Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data? It is not an original concept but specially in the Northern Africa it is a novel concept. 3) Are substantial conclusions reached? Yes. 4) Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined? Yes. 5) Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions? Yes. 6) Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes. 7) Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution? xxx 8) Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper? Yes. 9) Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

Yes. 10) Is the overall presentation well structured and clear? Yes. 11) Is the language fluent and precise? I do not know because I do not control very good the English language. 12) Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used? I think so. 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 (good and recent references). 15) Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate? I think.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 4, 957, 2007.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper