

Interactive comment on “Ecological adaptation as an important factor in environmental flow assessments based on an integrated multi-objective method” by T. Sun et al.

T. Sun et al.

suntao@bnu.edu.cn

Received and published: 8 October 2012

HESSD-9-6753-2012

Dear editor,

This letter accompanies a revised version of # hessd-9-6753-2012, “Ecological adaptation as an important factor in environmental flow assessments based on an integrated multi-objective method”. The paper has been revised carefully following the comments. Detailed responses to each comment are listed in the response to reviewer comments. In summary, the manuscript has undergone extensive revisions, including a reorganiza-
C4594

tion that provides a clearer introduction of the innovations of our study. The manuscript has been checked carefully with the assistance of professional manuscript editing services.

Thank you for your consideration of this revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Tao Sun, Ph.D Associate Professor School of Environment Beijing Normal University No.19, XijiekouWai St. Beijing 100875 P.R.CHINA Email:suntao@bnu.edu.cn Tel:86-10-58805053 Fax:86-10-51683778

Anonymous Referee #1 1. Specific comments: at line 24-27 of page 10: “When all of the studied species are considered, 25% and 112% of the average 25 annual river discharge were defined as the environmental flow boundaries, which were set according to the minimum requirements of the Crab and maximum requirements of the Jellyfish.” On what grounds should environmental flow boundaries be defined by minimum requirements of the Crab and maximum requirements of the Jellyfish? As illustrated in the method part of 2.2, the tolerance thresholds of recommended environmental flows considering multiple species are obtained by integrating the minimum and maximum water requirements of the keystone species, which could be seen in formular (6) and (7).

2. Technical correction (1): the writing for instance, at the first sentence of part 2.1 Consideration of a typical representative species: “Our a priori hypothesis for this evaluation was that...” should be altered with “Our one priori hypothesis for this evaluation was that...”. Done. A comprehensive examination for grammar errors has been made to the full text and no other similar mistake has been found.

3. Technical correction (2): At line 18 of page 13: “A favourable adaptable relationship was established...”, in which “favourable” should be altered with “favourably”, if I am right. Done. The sentence has been A comprehensive examination for spelling and

grammar errors has been made to the full text and no other similar mistake has been found.

In summary, the manuscript has undergone careful revisions, including one specific revision and two technical corrections. The manuscript has been checked carefully with the assistance of professional manuscript editing services.

Thank you for your consideration of this revised manuscript. Sincerely, Tao Sun

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/9/C4594/2012/hessd-9-C4594-2012-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 6753, 2012.