

Interactive comment on “Interpretation of GRACE data of the Nile Basin using a groundwater recharge model” by H. C. Bonsor et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 9 October 2010

My overall evaluation and recommendation are very similar to the first Reviewer. I agree with every point he/she made. Although I have found more problems in this manuscript, I think those critical points are enough to reject this paper. However, I encourage the Authors can carefully take into account the fair scientific opinions the first Reviewer has given, and re-submit this manuscript in a much better shape,

In general, I have strong impression that the author who was writing this manuscript, does not have solid hydrological background. I hope other co-authors can help, I am confident to say, any experienced hydrologists will have complaints to many statements the Authors made in this manuscript - including from water balance concept, modelling approach and presentation (say, without showing any validation result), interpretation of

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



GRACE data (using globally consistent fact that the water vapor contribution to GRACE signal is insignificant to infer precipitation recycling; unfortunately the inference was totally wrong), to recycling ratio, none of them are "entirely" scientifically sound.

I am sorry I do not see any way I can suggest major revision.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 4501, 2010.

HESD

7, C2798–C2799, 2010

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C2799

