

Interactive comment on “Applied tracers for the observation of subsurface stormflow at the hillslope scale” by J. Wienhöfer et al.

J. Wienhöfer

j.wienhoefer@bv.tum.de

Received and published: 16 June 2009

We appreciate the elaborate review of anonymous referee #1, and we have gladly integrated the suggestions into the revised manuscript.

Our response to the specific comments:

Comment 1): p. 2965, 13 and 18/19: The statement “Advantages of salt tracers are that they are non-sorptive and conservative.” is quite general. I think this should be specified / specify which salts behave conservative

Response to comment 1): Our statement is in fact too general. The idea was to roughly summarise the pros and cons of different tracers within this section. The use of the

C1217

inorganic salt tracers NaCl and NaBr was motivated by numerous studies like the ones cited exemplarily in the sentence before and which, generally summarised, do suggest conservative behaviour of these salt tracers. This clearly constitutes a major advantage for using these compounds as hydrologic tracers. Of course, this is not the case for other salts that may adsorb with a covalent binding (e.g. phosphate), or get degraded (e.g. nitrate). We specifically mean inorganic halogen compounds, especially bromide and chloride species, and will clearly state this in the revised manuscript.

The remaining comments on necessary technical corrections have been integrated into the revised manuscript without any exception.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 2961, 2009.