

Interactive comment on “HESS Opinions “More efforts and scientific rigour are needed to attribute trends in flood time series”” by B. Merz et al.

B. Merz et al.

bmerz@gfz-potsdam.de

Received and published: 5 April 2012

We thank the anonymous reviewer for the supportive and helpful comments. Below we address each comment and explain how we revise the manuscript in response:

P. 1348, l. 28. It is not clear from the text if the definitions of “detection” and “attribution” are taken from IPCC (2007) or are the authors’ own definitions.

Response: The definitions are taken from IPCC (2007). This will be made clear in the revised version.

P. 1349, l. 23. Reference to the unpublished work by Hundecha and Merz (2012) should be avoided throughout the paper.

C709

Response: Meanwhile, the Hundecha and Merz manuscript is in press and will be printed in 2 weeks. Hence, the Hundecha and Merz paper will be published before the hess opinion paper, and it will be properly referenced in the hess paper.

P. 1351, l. 24. For consistency “speculation” should be included in the assessment. In fact, some of the reviewed papers are regarded as “speculation”.

Response: The observation of referee 2 is correct that we regarded some papers as speculation. We will reformulate this sentence to clean this inconsistency. However, we prefer to stay with the 2-level appraisal, i.e. hard attribution if the 3 ingredients are given, and soft attribution for all other cases. Further differentiating would require drawing a line between soft attribution and speculation. This line is much more difficult to draw than the line between hard and soft. A more refined differentiation could lead to lengthy discussions about where speculation starts or ends, respectively. Such a discussion would not contribute to overcoming the key deficits that are discussed in the opinion paper.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 1345, 2012.

C710