

## ***Interactive comment on “Climate change and mountain water resources: overview and recommendations for research, management and politics” by D. Viviroli et al.***

**B. Schaefli (Editor)**

bettina.schaefli@epfl.ch

Received and published: 18 January 2011

### **Editor comments on the discussion and the extended response of the authors**

The very critical review of reviewer 3 challenged the authors to improve the scope, structure and content of their paper.

After a careful reading of the comments, answers and the revised manuscript, I decided to accept the manuscript for publication in HESS after an Editor review and without further reviewing. Two important reasons are:

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



1. The authors substantially modified the manuscript to take into account the comments of the 3rd review; the quality of the manuscript has improved and is now certainly a useful overview paper
2. The paper had two very positive reviews.

A wealth of the comments of the 3rd reviewer clearly express his/her point of view that a *review* paper should offer a complete picture of the state-of-the art. The authors' detailed answer essentially reinforces their point of view that their *overview* paper presents a useful but not exhaustive collection of challenges and recommendations. I agree with their viewpoint that such an overview is useful, especially for non specialists who are not familiar with mountain environments or in contrary, for highly specialist researchers who might not always see the broader picture of the environment they are working in. For a reader specialized in research on mountain water resources, the paper might not offer new insights.

The authors tried to follow the difficult pathway of discussing topics that are specifically relevant for mountain environments and leaving out topics that apply in all environments; the choice is necessarily incomplete and not always consistent.

Given the background of the authors of the manuscript, I think that a reviewer needs extremely good arguments to totally call into question the usefulness of their overview paper; but I agree with reviewer 3 that there is a certain risk: the risk of simply reiterating commonplaces, thereby hiding really interesting questions and possibly reinforcing common misinterpretations.

To my view, certain of the comments of reviewer 3 pinpoint some of these risks: that the paper might be seen e.g. as being slightly "colonialist" (see review 3, p. 5), as promoting a "top-down approach that foresees scientists as modellers and water managers as the model users" (review 3, p. 18), or "modelling as the only answer to watershed management" (review 3, p. 15). While these are interpretations of reviewer 3, they

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



were, nevertheless, triggered by the paper.

The authors made a considerable effort to eliminate part of the potential misinterpretations highlighted by reviewer 3 and to complete their overview. In addition, the public discussion will help readers of this manuscript to critically read the paper (and I invite the authors to include an explicit reference to the discussion in their final revised version).

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 7, 2829, 2010.

**HESD**

7, C4737–C4739, 2011

---

Interactive  
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C4739

