

Interactive comment on “Training hydrologists to be ecohydrologists and play a leading role in environmental problem solving” by M. E. McClain et al.

J. Seibert (Editor)

jan.seibert@geo.uzh.ch

Received and published: 29 April 2012

This is a valuable contribution to the special issue on education in hydrology. I also appreciate the constructive comments by the two referees. Both referee found the manuscript interesting and provided a number of comments to further improve the manuscript. Please address all these important points in your revision. Below I summarize the major issues.

Please define 'ecohydrology' in the introduction. While ecohydrology certainly can be interpreted quite widely, the definition has to be such that the differences between

C1131

hydrology and ecohydrology are clear. I agree with Tom Meixner, that the three currently probably most important research areas of ecohydrology ('spheres'), should be discussed as examples rather than as THE research areas. I read the section on professional competencies with great interest. Nevertheless I tend to agree with referee #1 that this part is too generic and would without hardly any change apply to almost any study subject. Instead, I would rather like to see a more specific discussion including the issue of necessary education in policy making as suggested by Tom Meixner.

Minor comment: The summary in Table 1 is interesting, but I would like the authors to do some more research for a more complete coverage. A quick google-search indicated that there are more ecohydrology centers and programmes than listed here (e.g., Ecohydrology Msc at the University of Kiel).

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 1481, 2012.