

Interactive comment on “The effect of water physical quality and water level changes on the occurrence and density of larvae of *Anopheles* mosquitoes around the shoreline of the Koka reservoir, Central Ethiopia” by B. M. Teklu et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 5 November 2010

Thanks for the opportunity to review this paper. I think the core analysis and findings are good, and reflect an important set of investigations. However, presentation of this paper needs to improve substantially for it to be worthy of publication. Some of this poor presentation is due to sloppiness (details in bullets). There is also the more important and broader issue of thinking critically about the analyses that were conducted. Clear, explicit justification should be given for why these investigations were undertaken; what questions were you trying to answer by performing these analyses? How were they

C3337

answered, and then so what? What are the implications of this for transmission and control of malaria? This is something that is seriously lacking from this paper, and which imposes the need for extensive revision to this paper. In its current state, I do not view this paper as worthy of publication. I would encourage the authors to think and communicate thoughts in the paper on why this topic merits publication, what gap it fills or value it adds.

Find below some points that came across to me while I read this:

• Paper is sloppy. For example, authors need to be correct and consistent in the way *Anopheles* is referred to. • Abstract could be punchier. What is the bigger picture implications of the finding? Why should I care about these findings? Why is the topic important and what is the specific gap that this paper is filling? Answers to these questions should also be reflected in the introduction. • In paragraph 1, I believe the Yohannes paper actually cites the Ghebreyesus paper, so there is no need to distill the small dam/tigray point into 2 sentences and cite both. • In the latter part of the intro, I think the authors need to do a far better job of highlighting why this research is important and what value it can or does add. • Later on in the paper, “r” rather than “r2” is commonly used. I think either i) r2 should be used, or ii) the authors should explain why they use r and not r2. • Page 6033, MASL that are stated for water levels are incorrect

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 6025, 2010.

C3338