

# ***Interactive comment on “Human amplified changes in precipitation-runoff patterns in large river basins of the Midwestern United States” by Sara A. Kelly et al.***

**C. Coccola**

cjc377@mail.usask.ca

Received and published: 18 December 2016

This manuscript uses historical data for four large river basins in the Midwestern United States to look at hydrological processes with the intent of examining whether any changes in hydrology to date have been influenced by climate change or human activities (specifically, artificial drainage). Research questions investigate: changes over time in climate, land use alteration, and streamflow; times of year changes are most prominent; and, if any changes can be explained simply by climate. While this article has potential, it should undergo additional editing and a significant rewrite prior to publication. The manuscript length should be reduced to improve both the focus and flow of the paper. Constructive comments are included below with the intent that

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



they may help in further refining this manuscript.

Please note this review does not cover the statistics used as there are other reviewers better positioned to evaluate these methods.

**Abstract (pages 1-2):** Guidelines for the Hydrology and Earth System Sciences Discussion (HESS D) journal note that abstracts should include a summary of the manuscript, highlighting key points and suggestions for future research (n.d.). This abstract is lengthy, with a word count of roughly 510 words. The abstract could be significantly shortened by further summarizing ideas and only including key points.

There are statements in the abstract that are not discussed in the paper and therefore, remain unsubstantiated. For example, Abstract, page 1, lines 13-15 states: “This makes it difficult to quantitatively disentangle the effects of climate change and artificial drainage intensification on the observed hydrological change, *often spurring controversial interpretations with significant implications for management actions*”. This is never elaborated on and no examples of controversial interpretations or their implications for management are provided in the body of the manuscript.

Another example is on page 2, lines 2-5 of the abstract which states: “Acknowledging both economic benefits and apparent detrimental impacts of artificial drainage on river flows, sediments, *and nutrients*, we question whether any other *human activity has comparably altered critical zone activities*, while remaining largely unregulated and undocumented.” Economic benefits are very briefly discussed in the introduction, but the body of the manuscript does not include comparison of impacts from any other activities to the impacts of artificial drainage. The presence of dams is noted in study areas, but there is no mention of how they may impact hydrological processes in basins over time. There is also no discussion on how artificial drainage impacts nutrients. Nutrients are only referenced in the first and last sentences of the introduction (page

2, line 10 and page 3, line 10). The reference to nutrients should be removed from the abstract as it is not elaborated on in the body of the manuscript.

Further, the HESS D guidelines state abstracts should include information on future studies to further research in this area. The abstract does not address this, but rather concludes with a note that artificial drainage needs to be better documented without providing any indication as to how this could be undertaken.

**Length and structure:** As noted above, this manuscript should be rewritten and the length of the paper should be significantly reduced. The length is not justified and the manuscript is heavy on details that do not add value. For example, there are lengthy descriptions of each of the study basins which in total span roughly five pages of the discussion paper. These study area descriptions contain large amounts of detail that while interesting, do not contribute to the research questions.

For example, the study area description for the Chippewa River Basin notes (page 8, lines 7-8) “The first hydropower dam on the Chippewa was constructed in 1878, and by 1950 there were a total of eight dams on the mainstem Chippewa River, which have heavily regulated streamflow in the basin”. As the manuscript does not reference these early dams or this timeframe again, this information is not necessary. Further, the study area description already contains statistics on the total number of dams in the basin which provides the reader with a better indication of human alteration in the study areas. To shorten the study area section of the manuscript, the authors could choose to start with a description of all four study basins, highlighting any similarities and differences. This could be followed by any key points for each individual basin that relate to the research questions.

Another significant issue with the length and structure is the large amount of text included in parentheses. This was often distracting, interrupting the flow of

sentences. A word count revealed almost 600 words in parentheses, not including references or acronyms. These sentences should be rewritten with the information directly included or removed. In some cases, information in parentheses was already included earlier in the manuscript. A couple of examples are included below.

- Page 12, lines 23-26: “We performed one-tailed student’s t-tests (and Wilcoxon Rank Sum tests if the data did not meet parametric assumptions after testing log, square root, and arcsince transformations) and Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test using the statistical program R to analyze changes in the mean and distribution of annual and monthly total flow (Q at the basin outlet) and precipitation (P) volumes between the defined pre-period and post-period.”

- Page 15, lines 19-22: “While relative amounts of drainage in this inventory should be reliable (i.e., greatest in MRB and IRB, relatively low, but tile drainage growing recently in the RRB, and very little in the CRB) the lack of historical documentation on changes in location, density and type of tile installed limits our ability to model hydrological change at the large landscape scale.”

The manuscript also contains redundancies which should be removed to shorten the paper and improve the flow. For example, the results and discussion section on page 22, lines 1-2 repeats some of the study methods noting: “We ran 286 t-tests and 286 KS tests, splitting the monthly precipitation and flow data at the flow and precipitation breakpoints, LCT breakpoints, as well as the 1974/1975 breakpoint.” Instead of restating the methods, the authors can launch directly into the results. For example: “Results from the t-tests and KS tests suggest...”. Another example of repeated results is on page 30, lines 1-19 of the conclusion which should be removed.

**Importance of Research and Linkages to Literature:** This manuscript could be strengthened by better identifying linkages to real-world application as well as how it furthers the current state of literature. For example, an ongoing debate in the hydrological community at the moment relates to the question of whether stationarity is

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



dead (see for example: Milly et al., 2008; Lins & Cohn, 2011; Montanari & Koutsoyianis, 2014; Milly et al., 2015). This manuscript relies on historical data to examine whether climate change or human activities have influenced hydrological process to date in order to inform future management and policy decisions. Given this, it would be interesting and relevant for the authors to comment on or acknowledge the debate of stationarity versus non-stationarity.

While the introduction attempts to draw connections between artificial drainage and impaired waters under the Clean Water Act, this is not elaborated on later in the paper. The paper also notes how undertaking the research at the basin level is important as this is the same scale regulators use (page 2, line 25; page 29, lines 7-8). However, the authors do not mention any implications of this research for water managers or regulators.

On page 29, lines 21-22, the authors state: “Until we have the information necessary to calibrate and validate watershed models, it will be difficult to deconvolve proportional impacts of climate and land use impacts [sic] on flows at large spatial scales.” This is followed on page 30, lines 24-28 by the statements: “Increases in precipitation in the Midwestern USA contribute to recently observed increases in streamflow, but the magnitude of precipitation increases alone cannot explain the observed increases in flow for agricultural basins. Therefore, it appears that the pervasive and extensive artificial drainage in agricultural basins has contributed to increase streamflow, not only at 102-103 km watershed scale, but also at the scale of very large basins studied here.” The first statement from page 30 notes it is difficult to determine whether the impacts to hydrological processes can be attributed to human land change or climate change; however, the statement that follows attributes artificial drainage to streamflow increases at the watershed and large basin scale. These statements appear contradictory, and there is no acknowledgement of any other factors which may have affected streamflow beyond precipitation and artificial

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



drainage. It seems unfounded to draw a clear line between streamflow and artificial drainage. It would perhaps be better for the authors to change the language to “suggest” a connection or to recommend this warrants further investigation.

As noted earlier, recommendations for future research directions are not included in this manuscript. The statement on page 29, lines 21-22 (referenced above) notes more information is needed to determine whether impacts are related to climate or human land-use change, but no recommendations are given for how future research could better calibrate or validate watershed models. Study limitations should be clearly outlined and linked to opportunities for future research.

### **Grammatical/minor comments:**

The manuscript appears to spell the word gauge “gage”. As authors, it is important to write for your audience. As HESS D has a global audience, it is important to use the language reflected in international literature. All spellings of “gage” should be corrected to “gauge”.

- Some examples: page 11, lines 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, and 23; page 18, line 1, title 4.3; page 19, line 8.

There are several instances where “&” is used instead of “and”. This makes the manuscript feel less polished and professional.

- Some examples: page 10, line 13; page 16, lines 10, 13, and 17; page 17, line 11; page 27, line 29.

There are some circumstances where using the word “we” may be unavoidable. However, sentences written in the first person tend to be more passive and informal. The word “we” is used heavily in this manuscript; 89 times in fact. In many cases, these sentences could be easily rewritten in a more active form to remove the “we”. Some examples are included below.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



- Page 11, line 11: “We followed a multiscale approach to analyze streamflow change...” could be rewritten as: “A multiscale approach was used to analyze streamflow change” or “Streamflow change was analyzed using a multiscale approach...”
- Page 13, line 16: “We have computed average annual water budgets for each basin...” could be changed to “Average annual water budgets were computed for each basin...”
- Page 5, lines 10-11: “We discuss the unique properties and histories of each basin below” could be changed to “Unique properties and histories of each basin are discussed below”

Acronyms are not used consistently throughout the manuscript. In some cases, acronyms are defined then never used again or change throughout the paper. More consistency is needed to help the reader follow defined terms. Some examples are listed below.

- Page 23, line 9 defines joint probability distribution function as “joint PDF”. However, on page 24, line 9, the authors use the acronym “JPDF”.
- Despite that each study basin is given a three letter acronym, the authors will at times continue to write out basin names. The Red River of the North Basin is defined as RRB early in the manuscript (page 6, line 1), but then later referred to as both the Red River Basin (page 14, line 19) and the Red River of the North Basin (page 18, line 16).

Commas are used heavily throughout the paper and result in run on sentences or disconnected thoughts. In many cases, these lines could be separated into multiple sentences or rewritten to remove commas. Some examples are included below.

- Page 15, line 3-5: “Although the 2012 census attempts to correct for incomplete and missing responses, because drainage enterprise records have traditionally been so poorly documented, it is difficult to know just how different the census reported acreage is from the actual acreage.”
- Page 29, lines 16-19: “Though drainage census data are prone to reporting the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



information necessary for modeling basin hydrology in large agricultural watersheds (such as drain size, depth, spacing, and extent), these are the most comprehensive inventory of drainage in the United States.”

Section titles should be concise, consistent, and reflect the underlying discussion. Section titles 1.1 (page 2, lines 8-9) and 1.2 (page 3, line 11) are the only titles in the manuscript phrased as questions, and only one of them includes a question mark.

The abstract and conclusion both state the data for this study corresponds to a 79 year period (page 1, line 17; page 29, line 7). The reader is left to assume this timeframe corresponds to the precipitation data outlined in the methods that date from 1935-2013 (page 10, line 19); however, this 79 year period is never explicitly stated.

There are many awkwardly worded sentences that should be rewritten. Some examples: page 9, lines 19-21; page 15, lines 3-5; page 27, line 19; page 28, lines 22-24.

Page 3, line 28: Sentence begins “And although the conversion of perennial grasses. . . .” Rephrase.

Page 22, lines 2-4: Sentence begins with “Because the p-values of the statistical tests. . . .” Rephrase.

Page 30, line 9: Typo. The comma should be changed to “with the” to read “The introduction of artificial drainage combined with the replacement of. . . .”

Page 8, line 1 refers to “the Driftless Area downstream of Chippewa Falls and Eau Claire.” The “Driftless Area” should be defined for readers who may not be familiar with this term.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)





Page 30, line 32: This statement needs a reference.

## References

Please see attached supplement for references.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/hess-2016-571/hess-2016-571-SC1-supplement.pdf>

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-571, 2016.

# HESD

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

