



Interactive comment on “Multilevel and multiscale drought reanalysis over France with the Safran-Isba-Modcou hydrometeorological suite” by J.-P. Vidal et al.

F Pappenberger (Editor)

florian.pappenberger@ecmwf.int

Received and published: 15 February 2010

I wish to thank the four referees for reviewing this manuscript. This study presents a modeling framework for assessing drought characteristics over France, during the past 50 years (1958–2008).

The paper as received on average very good reviews: "This is an excellent paper on the spatial and temporal dynamics of meteorological, agricultural and hydrological droughts in France." (reviewer 1)

"The paper is very interesting and well written." (reviewer 2)

C3363

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



"I agree with the other reviewers that the authors are to be commended for this comprehensive analysis of drought in France and also recommend the paper for publication." (reviewer 4)

The main criticism of the reviewers focuses on the limitations of this study, for example "whilst the authors do consider the limitations of their work, I think it would be well worth them underlining in the discussions and conclusions [...]" (reviewer 1) and in particular as "sing a model to evaluate drought can offer some advantages over just using point observations [...]. Some discussion of potential uncertainties with respect to the 10 year validation versus 50 year simulation, would be a nice addition." (reviewer 3)

Following Ratings have been given:

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)?

3xExcellent 1xGood 0xFair 0xPoor

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)?

2xExcellent 2xGood 0xFair 0xPoor

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 3xGood 1xFair 0xPoor

The authors have responded well to the individual reviewers and I thus have therefore no hesitation to accept the manuscript into HESS pending minor revisions.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper