

***Interactive comment on*** “**Technical Note:  
Analytical sensitivity analysis of a two parameter  
recursive digital baseflow separation filter**” *by*  
**K. Eckhardt**

**K. Eckhardt**

klaus.eckhardt@hswt.de

Received and published: 19 December 2011

Thank you for the comment!

1.

Referee #2 is right: Mathematical correctness requires an additional term  $b_0$  in the equations A3, A4, 5, and 6, that, however, can be neglected thereafter.

The subsequent remark could be a suggestion to complement the paper by a discussion of how the choice of the initial value  $b_0$  influences the filter result. Please see the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



attached file.

2. and 3.

The two catchments analysed by Eckhardt (2005) do not belong to the pool of the 65 catchments, which were analysed for the present paper.

I think it is no question that in general an analysis of 65 catchments yields more reliable results than an analysis of only two catchments. Furthermore - the second of these two catchment is a special case in that it has a hard rock aquifer - the value  $a = 0.925$  of the recession constant, which was selected as a starting point for the empirical sensitivity analysis by Eckhardt (2005), was not the result of a recession analysis, but was arbitrarily chosen.

K. Eckhardt

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/8/C5351/2011/hessd-8-C5351-2011-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 8, 9469, 2011.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

