Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
doi:10.5194/hess-2016-102-RC1, 2016

Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
Discussions
Open Access
EGU

Interactive comment on "An experimental seasonal hydrological forecasting system over the Yellow River basin – Part II: The added valuefrom climate forecast models" *by* Xing Yuan

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 2 April 2016

I find this study very well carried out and the paper very well written. Following the Part I of the study, the author investigated how much extra forecast skill the NMME ensembles can provide relative to the baseline statistical forecast (ESP) which relies on the initial hydrologic conditions only (no information from dynamic forecast). To my knowledge, NMME has not been looked at over the study area here, the Yellow River basin, and I think the study presented here offered a lot of new insights about NMME and seasonal scale hydrologic forecast in general. So I think the work here is more than enough significant for being considered published at HESS.

The analysis in the paper is focused on the two main drivers for surface hydrology, precipitation and air temperature, as well as two key hydrologic variables, soil moisture

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

and river streamflow. A land surface model (VIC) and a river routing model were used to derive the surface hdyrologic fluxes/states. The author also applied a number of important techniques like downscaling, bias correction, and post-processing in an effort to maximize the accuracy and skill of the final hydrologic forecasts. There is a solid amount of careful experiments and analyses. Besides the scientific quality, the author has also done a good literature review and the presentation is also well organized.

My main concern is about the technical details of the analysis. The main skill metric used is the Anomaly Correlation, defined in Equation (1) on page 6, as the correlation calculated over both time and space. I think the author needs to offer some reasoning to back up such a definition. Normally, the skill can be defined as the correlation between forecasts and observations in time only. Why to lump all locations together calculating the correlation? Why not calculate the correlation over different locations first and then average them up? I guess that the short length of the data records (29 years) might be a factor which makes the correlation calculations less robust. The current definition lumps all locations together and it is hard to distinguish between NMME's ability to resolve the dynamics in time and space. Because of that, I can't quite interpret some of the discussions later, for example, about the significance of low correlation in lines 5-8 on page 7. If we calculate the correlation over 38309 samples, then the correlation includes both those in time and space ... and in which part shall we measure the forecast skill?

Also, a very minor point – can you show an example of the hydrological post-processing? For example, to the time series of the raw, post-processed, and observed streamflow at one gauge? Did you train the regressions using data over the same period of 1982-2010 or a different period?

Overall, I think the paper can be published in HESS after minor revisions.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-102, 2016.