

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.

J. C. Bartholmes et al.

Received and published: 18 July 2008

The authors thank the editor for considering our paper "interesting and relevant to the scientific community". We also appreciated the discussion provided by two referees and addressed their questions and suggestions in order to improve the final version of the paper (see the answers to the referees).

We have also seriously thought about the suggestions on the separation or integration of our scientific study concerning the development (Part I) and forecasting assessment (Part II) of the EFAS ensemble hydrologic forecasting system.

We think that both parts of our study fit well the scope of HESS, as stated in the HESS webpage (<http://www.hydrology-and-earth-system-sciences.net/index.html>) by the Ed-

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



itors: the journal "encourages (...) fundamental and applied research (...)", as well as "multi-disciplinary" approaches and "(...) has the ambition to serve not only the community of hydrologists, but all earth and life scientists, water engineers and water managers, who wish to publish original findings on the interactions between hydrological processes and other physical, chemical, biological and societal processes within the earth system, and the utilization of this holistic understanding towards sustainable management of water resources, water quality and water-related natural hazards."

We think that the integration of Part 1 in Part 2 would probably make the paper too long for an easy-to-understand reading. As stated by Referee #2, the number crunching can make the reading at times difficult and the integration of conceptual and development aspects to the assessment of the quality of forecasts could probably discourage the readers because of the complexity of each aspect. This could be especially true if we consider that the topic may interest not only hydrologists, but also meteorologists and water resources managers.

Additionally, since in the answers provided by the authors for the discussion of Part 1 it is stated that the scientific content of this part could be improved following the suggestions of the referees, we believe that both Parts 1 and 2 could eventually be kept separated, still fitting the scope of HESS and interesting its readers.

In any case, following the final decision of the Editor, the authors are ready either to integrate those points described in Part 1 which are indispensable for the comprehension of the study presented in Part 2, or to keep the paper in two parts, integrating in both the fruitful remarks and suggestions of the referees.

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

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper