

Interactive comment on “Streamflow trends in Europe: evidence from a dataset of near-natural catchments” by K. Stahl et al.

S. Maskey (Referee)

s.maskey@unesco-ihe.org

Received and published: 13 October 2010

The paper is well structured well written. Particularly the number of records (132 to 441) used in the study is significant.

Main comment: (1) The paper presents results for 4 different periods based on number of data records available. What I found not well discussed in the manuscript is a comparative assessment of the differences in trend results among these periods. It is noticed from Table 1 that the period 1942-2004 has the highest % positive trends in majority of the indices tested than in all other periods. To show it more clearly, I prepared a graph with % of positive trends in the period 1942-2004 in the y-axis verses % of positive trends in other three periods in the x-axis. I think it is important to check if

there are specific reasons in this period to show the highest % of positive trends and should be discussed in the paper.

Other comments: (2) The authors prefer not to assess the significance of the trend tests (p. 5779-5780) but report only the % of positive and negative trends. I agree with some of the concerns of the authors in this regard. However, one of the good points about checking the statistical significance is that it is related to the number of data points, and this is something I would not overlook particularly when working with small number of data points. Although the length of the data points (time series) is not an issue in this study, it is preferable that this aspect is discussed in the relevant paragraph in the manuscript for completeness. (3) In Figures 1 and 3, the unit of the slope should be specified (in figure captions).

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/7/C2910/2010/hessd-7-C2910-2010-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 5769, 2010.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper