

Interactive comment on “Seasonal evaluation of the land surface scheme HTESSEL against remote sensing derived energy fluxes of the Transdanubian region in Hungary” by E. L. Wipfler et al.

F Pappenberger (Editor)

florian.pappenberger@ecmwf.int

Received and published: 3 March 2010

I thank the reviewers of this manuscript for their time and valuable comments.

All reviewers did point out the importance and significance of the subject matter of the contribution:

"The subject matter (evaluation of model-derived fluxes against observations) is important" (Reviewer 1)

"This paper is an attempt at one of the greatest challenge in the community which is to compare on an equal footing surface fluxes derived from remote sensing information with those simulated by models."(Reviewer 2)

"I think this paper displays an honest and useful approach to evaluating a land-surface model run in a distributed way." (Reviewer 3)

The major objection of 2 reviewers is that the " [...] assumption in the text "that the SEBAL fluxes (derived from remote sensing) are accurate enough to constitute "truth" for the evaluation." The authors address this in their response. Several other issues are raised.

Formal Manuscript Rating and Recommendation to the Editor

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 1xGood 2xFair 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)?

0xExcellent 1xGood 1xFair 1xPoor

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 0xFair 0xPoor

For final publication, the manuscript should be)suggested by reviewers): 1x accepted

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



as is, 0x accepted subject to minor revisions, 1x accepted subject to major revisions,
1x rejected

I invite the authors to submit a revised manuscript for additional peer review based on
the reviews and the responses of the authors to the review.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 6293, 2009.

HESD

6, C3418–C3420, 2010

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C3420

