

Interactive comment on “HESS Opinions “Urgent water challenges are not sufficiently researched”” by P. van der Zaag et al.

P. van der Zaag et al.

p.vanderzaag@unesco-ihe.org

Received and published: 20 April 2009

We thank Larry Swatuk for reviewing our paper and for his valuable suggestions. Here we respond to all specific issues raised. In a separate response we try to give a more coherent response addressing the major comments of all referees, taking advantage of observations made by other contributors, and drawing some conclusions.

- We will improve the abstract, which we agree does not adequately summarise the findings.
- Methodology: We have, in the mean time, complemented our ISI search with similar searches within Scopus (Gupta and Van der Zaag 2009). The findings are mostly very similar. We are now working towards a more comprehensive assessment of the issue,

C351

by conducting a thorough and comparative analysis of ISI, Scopus and Google Scholar. See also our discussion in our general response (see separate document).

- About the possible research activities by governments and private consultants that are not published: this is an interesting possibility. But there is a fundamental issue related to grey literature that is difficult to access and that has not gone through a transparent peer review system. This we have elaborated in our general response (see separate document).
- That there might be a relationship between the speed of change in a disciplinary field and the number of publications in that field is an interesting hypothesis, but falls beyond the scope of this comment.
- We fully agree that the use of the verb “prove” in our article (p.1414, 6) was inappropriate. We will replace it by the verb “illustrate”.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 6, 1411, 2009.