

Interactive comment on “The evolution of root zone moisture capacities after land use change: a step towards predictions under change?” by Remko Nijzink et al.

FF Fenicia (Editor)

fabrizio.fenicia@eawag.ch

Received and published: 26 October 2016

Main comments

Dear Authors, the reviewers have provided a generally positive evaluation of your work, and they have identified important areas needing clarification and improvement. I do not think that the reviewers concerns will be too problematic to address.

In addition to the reviewers comments, I would like to point you towards the following paper:

Westra, S., M. Thyer, M. Leonard, D. Kavetski, and M. Lambert (2014), A strategy for diagnosing and interpreting hydrological model nonstationarity, *Water Resour. Res.*,

C1

50, 5090–5113, doi:10.1002/2013WR014719

Which considers the non-stationarity of the SuMax parameter, and therefore is closely related to your work. I would like to see this paper not only cited but also discussed.

I would prefer to see separate results and discussion sections. Otherwise it is difficult to separate results that are directly supported by your analysis (results section), and interpretations that may go beyond it (discussions).

Other comments

As per HESS guidelines, multi-letter variables should be avoided. In Table 3 for example, you should refer to the signatures with 1 capital and the rest subscripts. E.g. you can call all signatures with the Greek letter gamma, and then subscripts to identify the particular signature.

What is n in Eq 8, 9, 10?

Eq 10: you have Z_{p95} in the equation and Z_{95} in the description. Use consistent notation

Eq 10: $SR_{,20r}$ in the equation and $SR_{,20yr}$ in the description. Also don't use the star as a multiplier. Either the dot or nothing.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-427, 2016.