

Interactive comment on “Competence formation and post-graduate education in the public water sector in Indonesia” by J. M. Kaspersma et al.

H. Zoyer (Referee)

hans.zoyer@waterpool.org

Received and published: 19 April 2012

The paper is well structured and has clear results. However, It is disputable on the fact, that it covers only the staff of Directorate General Water Resources and might not represent the entire public water sector in Indonesia. Finally I am somehow missing suggestions how to proceed with educational approaches for competence building of personnel.

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific questions within the scope of HESS?

The scope of HESS is not directly applied since the paper deals primarily with statistical approaches in local and international education

C1007

2. Does the paper present novel concepts, ideas, tools, or data?

The concepts presented are well reproducible

3. Are substantial conclusions reached?

The conclusions reaches are not of great significance since the number of respondents is limited on the DGWR of Indonesia

4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and clearly outlined?

Yes

5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and conclusions?

Recommendations for an improvement of educational activities are somehow missing

6. Is the description of experiments and calculations sufficiently complete and precise to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)?

Statistically yes

7. Do the authors give proper credit to related work and clearly indicate their own new/original contribution?

Yes

8. Does the title clearly reflect the contents of the paper?

Not entirely since the Water Directorate will not represent the whole public water sector of the country (less than 100 respondents)

9. Does the abstract provide a concise and complete summary?

Summary is ok

10. Is the overall presentation well structured and clear?

Yes

C1008

11. Is the language fluent and precise?

Language is excellent

12. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations, and units correctly defined and used?

There are only a few abbreviations

13. Should any parts of the paper (text, formulae, figures, tables) be clarified, reduced, combined, or eliminated?

No

14. Are the number and quality of references appropriate?

Very good relation

15. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material appropriate?

Yes.

Interactive comment on *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 9, 629, 2012.

C1009