

Interactive comment on “An opportunity of application of excess factor in hydrology” by V. Kovalenko et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 28 June 2013

This article is very badly written, and is hardly understandable.

If the authors are not familiar with english language they must use short and simple sentences to deliver their message. A sentence as "The article shows, ...over a flow" in the abstract is very long and just does not make sense. And unfortunately there are quite a lot like this in the article.

The authors advocate the use of the excess factor (called usually kurtosis) to deal with instability. Instability is not clearly defined. How the use of the kurtosis would help to deal with instability neither. Is the estimation of the kurtosis an indicator for instability? Or a way to evaluate the tail of the probability distribution?

Formula (11) gives an expression of the error of Eh that depends only on n, it seems

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



strange. The formula giving the error of E_h in table 2 is not justified.

The fact that statistical estimators are more stable when the number of observations increases is an obviousness.

I am sorry not being able to give more relevant comments, but I really missed most of the message of this article due to the very bad writing.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 9, 13635, 2012.

HESD

9, C7229–C7230, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C7230

