

Interactive comment on “The seven rules for hydrologists and other researchers wanting to contribute to the water management practice” by E. Mostert and G. T. Raadgever

E. Mostert and G. T. Raadgever

Received and published: 14 July 2008

Dear editor,

Thank you for the comments on our paper, which have helped us to further improve our paper. As suggested, we have added more examples (see below) in order to make the paper less "theoretical and dry" and show more convincingly the relevance and importance for hydrology and water management. In addition, we have made several small editorial improvements.

In addressing the comments, we have assumed that, at this stage of the review process, the topic and basic approach of our paper are considered appropriate for HESS. As we made clear already in the first version, our paper addresses issues that are rele-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



vant and important for hydrology and water management (and rarely addressed in this context), but most of the issues addressed are also relevant for other types of research and for other forms of natural resources management.

Comment nr. 1

This last point is relevant for the comment that the paper is "too shallow and unspecific on water-related issues in the science-policy interface". We have assumed that this does not mean that our paper should limit itself to issues that are exclusively relevant for water. That would result in a very incomplete paper and would moreover severely hinder interdisciplinary cooperation between the "water sciences" and other relevant disciplines. Instead, we have taken this comment to mean that the relevance and importance for water should be made more clear. We have followed the suggestion to give more examples and illustrations (see below). In addition, we have double-checked that we have not missed any water-specific issues.

- In section 2, we use flood risk management as an example in the (expended) discussion on identifying the relevant certified expertise.

- In section 3, a short discussion of the research by Hermans (2005) has been added, which deals specifically with stakeholder analysis for water experts.

- Section 4 refers to illegal abstractors as stakeholders that one may not want to work for.
- Section 5 already contained several water examples.

- In section 6, we now give an example of collaboration with a too limited number of stakeholders, coming from the NeWater project.

- In section 7, an example of bad expert communication has been added, also coming from the NeWater project.

Only section 8 does not have a water-specific example or illustration. It discusses a topic that is relevant for science in general, but we think that the relevance for water science is clear enough as it is.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



We had some difficulties in reconciling the comment that our paper is "theoretical and dry" with earlier comments that our paper is "interesting to read" (referee 4) and "an interesting addition to the literature" (referee nr. 1). Admittedly, the paper is at times a bit abstract. Partly, this is because it is essentially a literature study and not an empirical study. We hope that the added examples and illustrations (see above) make it a bit more concrete. In addition, we have made several minor editorial changes to improve the "flow" and readability.

As to the title: we could follow the suggestion of the editor. The first version had the word "hydrologists" in the title, but following the comment of referee 5 we skipped it because many of the issues discussed have a broader relevance. The relevance for hydrologists is made clear in the abstract, in the introduction, by the water-related examples and illustrations and, after publication, by the journal in which it is published. If we add the word "water" or "hydrologists" in the title, we would suggest that the issues discussed in the paper are only relevant for water. That being said, if necessary we are willing to add the word "water".

The paper now gives two examples from the NeWater project (see above). (We are not directly involved in ACER, but cooperate with them in one case study. In the SQR-project the first author was more an observer.) In addition, we have added a reflection on the paper itself in the conclusion, which applies the analysis from section 2, the basis of the paper, to the paper itself.

Comment nr. 2

The issues raised in comment nr. 2 are indeed very interesting and important questions, but, as the editor already hinted at, they are beyond the scope of our paper. We target researchers and what they can do, and not policy makers.

Comment nr. 3

The purpose of the short section 3 is to emphasize the need to do a stakeholder anal-

HESSD

5, S669–S673, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



ysis, not to provide a methodology for this or to do a stakeholder analysis ourselves. The water-related example that has been added shows that for many water experts this is not obvious. As to the question "people having a stake in what???": in the policy process. We have added this in the first sentence.

Comment nr. 4

In his book *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*, Beck outlines the structural change of industrial society and the development of a new "risk society". The new society is called risk society because the distribution of risk is central, whereas in industrial society this was the distribution of wealth. These issues go far beyond the scope of Box 2. Specifically concerning risks, Beck argues, first, that risk assessment is not a neutral activity and, second, that science has also created new risks by demanding that there should be hard proof of risks. The first point is already covered in our paper using more specific references. The second point applies more to pollution, which he focuses on, than to (flood risks, which Box 2 focuses on. That being said, in chapter 7 Beck offers an interesting analysis of the changing role of science in society. Consequently, we have added references to Beck in the introduction and in section 2 on the nature and possible roles of science.

Comment nr. 5

p. 1: Abstract: "most to the water management practice": The paper has been checked by a professional English editor. Originally, we had written "the water management practice", but she changed this into "water management practice". We have double checked this.

p 6, 9: The reference to Ridder et al. has been added.

p. 8: The editor did not like "a lot of": This may be a matter of taste. We think that, in combination with "self-reflection", "a lof of" is not too colloquial, also considering the not-so-formal style of the rest of the paper.

HESSD

5, S669–S673, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



p. 11: "Of" has been added.

p.12 "Research use" or "research utilization" and "use of research" are the common expressions in English. ("Research" refers not only to the research process, but also to the product (report, article), as for instance in the sentence "Have you seen his research on centipedes?")

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 5, 843, 2008.

HESSD

5, S669–S673, 2008

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

