

## ***Interactive comment on “The European Flood Alert System EFAS – Part 2: Statistical skill assessment of probabilistic and deterministic operational forecasts” by J. C. Bartholmes et al.***

**L. Pfister (Editor)**

pfister@lippmann.lu

Received and published: 6 November 2008

This final comment concerns both papers (part 1 & 2) submitted by Thielen et al. (The European Flood Alert System &#8211; Part 1 : Concept and development) and Bartholmes et al. (The European Flood Alert System &#8211; Part 2 : Statistical skill assessment of probabilistic and deterministic operational forecasts). The topic of the manuscripts is focusing on the European Flood Alert System (EFAS), which is presented as a tool that helps improving the pre-event management of floods in large European river basins through medium-range deterministic and probabilistic flood fore-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

casting (from 3 to 10 days in advance). Part 1 is meant to provide information relative to the scientific approach that has been implemented for the set-up of the EFAS system. In part 2, the authors focus on a performance assessment of the EFAS forecasts on the basis of existing operational forecasts that had been elaborated over a time-spin of 2 years. During the review process, some concerns were risen by the reviewer's regarding the need of having two seperate manuscripts. In other words, there were suggestions on a possible merge of both papers. In the end, also as a reaction to the arguments brought forward by the authors in response to the reviewer's comments in this respect, the option of 2 papers can be retained. However, the authors will have to stay as close as possible to the recommendations formulated by the reviewers. The scientific merit of paper no. 1 needs to be better emphasized. The authors should show in the revised version of part 1 to what respect the EFAS system really is innovative and to what extend it cannot only be simply regarded as a valuable alternative in data poor regions as stated by referee #1. Part 2, submitted by Bartholmes et al., is subject to less comments and requires only minor corrections. The authors should consider more specifically the comment made by referee #2 on the evaluation of the EFAS system in comparison to other existing flood forecasting systems. Some technical terms that clearly stem from meteorology should also be shortly explained, in order to allow for a straightforward reading of the manuscript. In any case, all comments made by the referees should be taken into consideration by the authors and addressed while preparing the revised versions of the manuscripts.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 5, 289, 2008.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

