

Interactive comment on “The turbidity behavior in an Amazon floodplain” by E. Alcântara et al.

E. Alcântara et al.

enner@dsr.inpe.br

Received and published: 20 August 2009

Response to Anonymous Referee # 1

General Comments:

Referee #1: ‘Therefore, the beginning of the paper should be more clearly exposed, in a fluent and logic sequence.’

Authors: We will rewrite the introduction to make clear in a logic sequence.

Referee #1: ‘Several aspects of the spatial measurements should be more clearly described to give a better idea on how they were made. Well structured sentences in English alternate with poor ones, the text containing many mistakes’

Authors: We will give more information of how the spatial measurement was made.
C1889

Also the English will be revised.

Specific Comments:

Referee #1: ‘Secchi disk is a measure of transparency and not a direct measure of turbidity.’

Authors: We understand your collocation and we will rewrite the paragraph.

Referee #1: ‘Study Area ...’

Authors: We will make clearer the study area characteristics.

Referee #1: ‘Precipitation and climate data should come at beginning... Then, all information should report to each phase in such a way that in the end the reader has a whole picture of the floodplain...’

Authors: We will move this section to the beginning followed by floodplain phases as you advice.

Referee #1: ‘Related to Fig. 12c, wind direction is northwest to southeast instead of NE to SW.’

Authors: This wind direction will be correct.

Referee #1: ‘Here, frequency of measurements and number of points established for the study are lacking, as in Fig. 7, indicated in the text, one can hardly see the number of stations.’

Authors: The frequency of measurements will be inserted clearly in the text

Referee #1: ‘... a natural barrier mentioned here is unclear and needs an explanation’

Authors: The natural barrier mentioned here is a slice of land that passes through the floodplain that is a barrier for wind and water flow. We will explain in more detail in the final text in accordance to your advice.

Referee #1: 'Questions on the whole content of the article, whose answers could be incorporated in the "Conclusions. . ."'

Authors: All mentioned questions will be inserted in the conclusions.

Referee #1: 'The text needs an extensive linguistic revision; it is difficult to enumerate here all the mistakes involving mainly structural aspects. Abbreviations of publications should be checked as, for instance, in Lima et al. (1995), Roozen et al. (2003), Tundisi et al. (2004). The article is a good contribution but needs improvement.'

Authors: All the mistakes will be corrected and also the abbreviations will be checked.

Thanks for help us improve the paper.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 3947, 2009.