

Interactive comment on “Combining flow routing modelling and direct velocity measurement for optimal discharge estimation” by G. Corato et al.

FF Fencia (Editor)

fencia@lippmann.lu

Received and published: 21 July 2011

I thank all the reviewers and I invite the Authors to take into account all their comments, and to revise their paper accordingly. All reviewers complained about the complexity of the paper. Having read the paper myself I agree with this criticism, which arises, in addition to the points made by the reviewers, from the fact that the Authors do not always provide all the details that are necessary to follow the steps they have made. Submitting a paper in the field of hydraulics to HESS implies that the Authors are willing to communicate their results to a more general audience. For this reason, it is particularly necessary to improve the paper clarity and ensure its generality.

The Authors have to better explain what they have done and why they have done it in a

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



certain way. They could have a paragraph with some background, rather than starting with Equations 1, 2 and 3 without providing sufficient reference and without explaining the assumptions behind them. Also the explanation of the model is unclear. What are the reasons for solving the equation in that precise way? What is the background? What did other Authors do?

The entropic model is another addition that add complexity to the paper, but is it really necessary to convey the message of the paper? If not, the Authors should remove it, and concentrate on the main arguments.

There are several tables in the paper. Can these be translated and summarized with some figures?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 2699, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper