

Interactive comment on “Comparison of different base flow separation methods in a lowland catchment” by A. L. Gonzales et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 21 July 2009

General comments

The paper comparing different base flow separation methods is of great interest to the community and in the scope of the journal. The paper is generally well structured (apart from some confusion between results and discussion). The science is sound and exciting. Some revision on the English is necessary to improve the paper – please check grammar and phrasing - some comments are made in the following. The abstract is generally well written and sparks interest. Suggestions for some minor changes are included below. A table would help to better highlight the differences between alternative methods presented on page 3486. I would generally suggest separating the discussion from the conclusions. This could also help to discuss the findings of

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



this study in regard to their particularity for lowland areas as mentioned throughout the abstract and introduction but not really done later in the paper. Please find some specific remarks for a minor revision below.

Specific remarks

3484/4 – Sentence starting with: “Moreover. . .” Not necessary

3484/16 – GW-flooding?

3484/18 – determined?

3484/23 – better reformulate “separate” – may be “identify”?

3484/28 – Resulted in good results – please reformulate

3485/3 – Change to: “Understanding runoff generation processes. . .”

3485/21 – Please rephrase sentence beginning with: “That is why. . .”

3486/5 – Sentence needs rephrasing

3486/22 – Please describe under which conditions this applies

3487/10 – somewhat more sophisticated calculation methods – please specify – this is to imprecise

3487/17 – paper objectives are rather unspecific – please explain in more detail – especially the relation to lowland areas

3489/7 – sentence needs rephrasing – English in rest of sub-section requires improvement

3490/23 – at what intervals?

3491/12 – again – at what intervals?

3492/10 – How valid is this assumption?

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



3496/20 – can this be quantified?

3497/2 – please rephrase – confusing sentence

3497/4 – Is this a result or an assumption?

3498/14 – Any data to back this up?

3501/5 – Last paragraph belongs into discussion!

Figures & tables:

Fig1: Please increase symbol size for weirs and inlets

Fig2: Boreholes and their depth hard to identify

Fig3: Please explain abbreviations as OWS etc

Fig4: What does mm/4-h mean?

Fig5: Hard to differentiate between Ca and Mg tracers

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 3483, 2009.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper