

Interactive comment on “Computer-supported games and role plays in teaching water management” by A. Y. Hoekstra

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 21 May 2012

1. The article provides good and convincing arguments and evidence of the benefits of using these type of games in teaching complex water management strategies.
2. The balance between the description of the two games and the discussion and conclusion is somewhat skewed, however, where the discussion/conclusion section is quite thin. I understand the argument made by the authors that it is difficult to find other research on this topic for a comparative analysis, but it would therefore be of even more relevance for him to try expand further based on the experience he has.
3. As an example: The conclusion that "these tools are not to be seen as replacements to lectures...." is quite weak and could be further elaborated. What is the "enrichment" they provide? is it because students are allowed to "test" theoretical knowledge in

C1579

"practice"? Is it because it allows students or "practitioners" to test different management approaches and explore the various outcomes?

4. The article would become considerably stronger if it included a section describing feed-back from previous students that have taken the role-play(s) and then applied the skills/knowledge in real-life situations. If the author would include those experiences in the analysis, it would strengthen the "case" for this methodology (as I am sure the feed-back would be positive.....). I have received considerable feed-back from many of the students I have had (and in particular practitioners) in my own role-plays and it has been of great help both to further develop the games, but also to better understand how the participants can make use of the skills and knowledge they acquire (sometimes in ways I could not imagine).

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 1859, 2012.