

## ***Interactive comment on “Comparison of hydrological model structures based on recession and low flow simulations” by M. Staudinger et al.***

**Dr Andréassian**

vazken.andreassian@cemagref.fr

Received and published: 15 July 2011

This is an interesting paper.

It is my personal opinion that a case study on a single catchment provides too limited information to be of any generic use. But a single catchment remains interesting as an illustration, and this is why I regret not seeing any hydrograph, showing the different simulations yielded by the different model simulation.

Moreover, p.6843 and 6844, the way you present recession analysis is a little disturbing, it is not clear at first sight that it is a way of analyzing model results and not an additional multi-model treatment. Again, on a single catchment, you could as well show the reader

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



directly recession curves and flow duration curves.

Two minor remarks:

- . a typo in line 20, p.6842: NS varies between minus infinity and 1
- . the review of model intercomparisons p. 6835 seems quite succinct... may I suggest you to have a look at a piece of work which still remains a reference by the number of models considered and the number of catchments? It did specifically consider low flows with the same criterion you use :

Perrin, C., C. Michel & V. Andréassian, 2001. Does a large number of parameters enhance model performance? Comparative assessment of common catchment model structures on 429 catchments. *Journal of Hydrology*, 242 (3-4): 275-301.

Vazken Andréassian

---

Interactive comment on *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 8, 6833, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper