

Interactive comment on “Analysis of projected hydrological behavior of catchments based on signature indices” by M. C. Casper et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 2 May 2011

This is an interesting manuscript that, in the text, focuses too much on what has not been done rather than analyzing the interesting results that the authors have. I recommend revising the text to have a simpler and easier to follow structure focusing on three aspects (bias correction, signature analysis, comparative analysis across watersheds). If the authors focus the paper on this then they will have a valuable contribution. More specific comments below.

- Abstract should contain more specific conclusions and not focus on future work. What has been learned that was not known before? There are specific results in the paper, why not include them in the abstract? For example, what causes the differences between the catchments? - The introduction section needs to be more focused: climate

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



change, bias correction, event scale, model diagnostic, ... All relevant, but it is difficult to read the introduction and see what the story of the paper is going to be. Focus the work. What is central and what is just secondary? E.g. the climate is changing, we need to assess the impact, so models need to work for the right reasons - and here is how we assess this. (Or a storyline of this kind) - Avoid one sentence paragraphs. - Why is one catchment more affected by the bias correction than the others? - My comment about the discussion/outlook section is the same as for the introduction. Why not give it a simple structure? E.g. we assessed three issues: bias correction, etc. and here are our main conclusions and what they mean. The section starting with "Figure 4 shows..." is for example not really connected to the rest of the section. Also, why is this section mainly about what the authors are going to do in the next paper? Discuss what you found here and what it means. Then use a conclusions section to summarize and add the outlook.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 3571, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

