



***Interactive comment on* “Critical review of the application of SWAT in the upper Nile Basin countries” by A. van Griensven et al.**

J. Seibert

jan.seibert@geo.uzh.ch

Received and published: 27 April 2012

The authors raise with this interesting manuscript an important issue, namely that modelling studies in general cannot be reproduced, or at least be understood, based on the information given in a journal paper. While this is a problem with no easy solution until there are procedures to publish model code and data, the authors list several points that could improve the situation and at least provide crucial information on the model application and model performance. Besides the points already listed I would suggest that also information on the calibration procedure (manual-automatic, objective function, parameter limits, ...) should be given routinely. Furthermore, it would be useful to also always comment on data quality. In the Blue Nile area, there can, like in many

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



other areas, be important problems with data quality. In such situations, model performance should also be related to what actually can be achieved given the available data. This relates to the 'limits-of-acceptability' question (see recent work by K.Beven) in general including issues such as rating curve uncertainties.

I congratulate the authors to this important work and hope that this manuscript will help starting a much needed discussion on standards for the publication of modeling results.

Minor comment: The reference Mango et al. is missing.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 3761, 2012.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

