

Interactive comment on “The European flood risk directive: challenges for research” by E. Mostert and S. J. Junier

FP Pappenberger (Editor)

florian.pappenberger@ecmwf.int

Received and published: 13 October 2009

I am very grateful that 4 reviewers have been giving their time to review this manuscript. This indicates that it is an important, interesting and timely topic. The authors can be congratulated on this achievement.

However, a large number of critical points have been raised. The discussions by the reviewers are very insightful and interesting comments in themselves. The authors have responded to all comments sufficiently and indicated where changes in the manuscript can be made. This makes this discussion interesting to read.

The scientific significance of the paper has been rated by the reviewers between 'Fair'

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



and 'Poor' as well as the the scientific quality. The presentation quality is on average 'Fair' (see below for definitions). The large majority of the reviewers suggested 'Major Revisions'.

The manuscript cannot be accepted into HESS in its current form, however, the authors are encouraged to submit a revised version with substantial changes, which will have to be peer reviewed again. I am look forward to this submission.

regards,

florian pappenberger

Formal Manuscript Rating and Recommendation

1) Scientific Significance

Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of this journal (substantial new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)?

0xExcellent 0xGood 2xFair 2xPoor

2) Scientific Quality

Are the scientific approach and applied methods valid? Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way (consideration of related work, including appropriate references)?

0xExcellent 0xGood 2xFair 2xPoor

3) Presentation Quality Are the scientific results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well structured way (number and quality of figures/tables, appropriate use of English language)?

0xExcellent 1xGood 2xFair 1xPoor

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 4961, 2009.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

